Representation of hope in a canonical dystopian novel: female characters, love-triangle and humanisation in *We, Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

Iida-Tuulia Ristimella
Master's Thesis
English
Faculty of Humanities
University of Oulu
Autumn 2020

Abstract

In this thesis, I analyse the representation of female characters and their relation to the representation of utopian hope in three canonical literary dystopias: Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We* (1921), Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1948). Although research on these famous works has been conducted using varying approaches and perspectives over the past century, I suggest that since the thematic and generic setting is so similar in these works, a comparative narrative analysis provides an interesting opportunity to examine some of the less well-known differences and similarities between these canonical texts. I argue that through humanisation, the main female character's representation contributes to the representation of utopian hope, which characterises the genre of literary dystopias.

In the novels in question, the main female characters are depicted as eccentric, intelligent individuals with distinct characteristics, whereas the regular citizens of the imagined dystopian societies are depicted as a standardised mass completely controlled by the State power. The main female characters are also characterised by an unorthodox view on sexuality and by personal feelings, which is eccentric, since emotions are considered a threat to the social stability and therefore the State aims to abolish natural feelings from its dystopian society. Hence, the main female characters embody the fundamental human traits that are often emphasised in literary dystopias as the only source of hope in resisting the dystopia. The main female characters are also associated with the past by associating them with nature and depicting them as having feelings that should not exist in the imagined dystopian State. In addition, the main female characters are depicted as catalysts to the protagonist's process of humanisation and individualisation. Due to these aspects, the main female character is humanised in the narrative, and her humane features are contrasted by the woman of the dystopian norm through a love-triangle setting, which further foregrounds her eccentricity. The main female character is described as embodying the characteristics the author seems to consider crucial in resisting the potential dystopia, thus making her representation a significant factor in transmitting the utopian hope to the reader. Hence, the representation of the female characters contributes to the function of dystopian novels, namely giving the reader hope of avoiding the inhuman future dystopia depicted in the narrative.

Tiivistelmä

Tämän tutkimuksen kohteena on naishahmojen representaatio ja sen yhteys utooppisen toivon representaatioon kolmessa dystopiakirjallisuuden kaanoniin kuuluvassa teoksessa, jotka ovat Yevgeny Zamyatinin *Me* (1921), Aldous Huxleyn *Uljas uusi maailma* (1932) ja George Orwellin *Vuonna 1984* (1948). Vaikka kyseisiä teoksia on tutkittu useasta eri näkökulmasta ja monia eri menetelmiä hyödyntäen viimeisen vuosisadan aikana, teosten samankaltaisten teemojen ja asetelmien vuoksi vertaileva narratiivianalyysi tarjoaa mahdollisuuden analysoida näiden tekstien vähemmän tunnettuja eroja ja samankaltaisuuksia. Tutkimuksen tavoitteena on osoittaa, että narratiivissa tapahtuvan hahmojen humanisoinnin myötä naishahmojen representaatio vaikuttaa merkittävästi utooppisen toivon representaation, joka on oleellinen piirre dystopia-kirjallisuudessa.

Kyseisissä romaaneissa naispäähahmot on kuvattu omalaatuisina ja älykkäinä yksilöinä, jotka poikkeavien piirteidensä vuoksi eroavat tavallisista dystopisten yhteiskuntien asukkaista, jotka kuvataan teoksissa täysin valtiovallan kontrolloimina, yhdenmukaistettuina massoina. Naispäähahmoja luonnehtii myös epätavanomainen suhtatutuminen seksuaalisuuteen sekä henkilökohtaisten tunteiden omaaminen, vaikka kyseisissä kuvitelluissa dystopioissa tunteita pidetään uhkana yhteiskunnallisen vakauden säilyttämiselle, minkä vuoksi valtio pyrkii poistamaan luonnolliset tunteet kokonaan. Yksilöllisyyden, tunteiden ja seksuaalisuden kautta naispäähahmot ruumiillistavat inhimillisiä piirteitä, jotka puuttuvat teoksissa kuvatuista epäinhimillisistä yhteiskunnista. Näitä inhimillistäviä piirteitä usein painotetaan dystopia-kirjallisuudessa ainoina toivonlähteinä dystopian vastustamisessa. Naispäähahmot myös yhdistetään menneisyyteen luonnon ja tunteiden kautta, sillä niillä ei ole arvoa tarinan nykyisyydessä. Lisäksi naispäähahmot kuvataan katalysaattoreina miespäähenkilön inhimillistymis- ja yksilöitymisprosessille. Näiden tekijöiden vuoksi naispäähahmo on humanisoitu narratiivissa, ja hänen inhimillisyytensä rinnastetaan kolmiodraama-asetelmaa hyödyntämällä naishahmoon, joka edustaa dystopista normia, mikä edelleen korostaa päänaishahmon omalaatuisuutta. Päänaishahmo kuvataan niiden piirteiden ruumiillistumina, joita kirjailija vaikuttaa pitävän oleellisina mahdollisen dystopian vastustamisessa, mikä tekee naishahmojen representaatiosta merkittävän tekijän utooppisen toivon välittämisessä. Näin ollen naishahmojen representaatio vaikuttaa dystopisten romaanien tavoitteen toteutumiseen, eli toivon antamiseen siitä, että romaanissa kuvattu epäinhimillinen tulevaisuus voidaan vielä välttää.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

In this thesis, I will examine three canonical dystopian novels: Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We* (1921/2017), Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932/2004) and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1948/1977). These are the best-known literary dystopias written during the first half of the twentieth century, and they all depict a totalitarian State that aims to extinguish individuality and turn the citizens into collective masses in order to guarantee social stability. Although research on these famous works has been conducted using varying approaches and perspectives over the past century, I suggest that since the thematic and generic setting is so similar in these works, a comparative narrative analysis provides an interesting opportunity to examine some of the less well-known differences and similarities between these canonical texts, such as the representation of the female characters.

Research on canonical literary dystopias typically focuses on the author's views on themes such as totalitarianism, threat of science, sexuality and human nature either in the novel's historical context or in relation to the current social issues (see e.g. Sunstein (2005) and Tirohl (2000)). All utopian literature is strongly related to its historical context, since the function of the genre has traditionally been to critique the prevailing society, which explains why the social approach is often chosen when discussing the dystopian novels. Practical analysis of the novels' narrative, on the other hand, is less common. Furthermore, if the narrative is analysed, the analysis usually focuses on the male protagonist and his process of change depicted in the novel, namely, how he finally realises the horrors of the society and finally acts against the totalitarian State power, which is a central element in the narrative of a canonical dystopian novel (Baccolini & Moylan, 2003). Nevertheless, there are usually at least two female characters that I suggest are as central to the novel's narrative and the reflection of dystopian elements as the male protagonist is. In this thesis, I will focus on the representation of hope, one of the common elements of literary dystopias, which I argue is embodied in the main female character in *We*, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The main female character is depicted as more human in comparison to the standardised dystopian citizens and as a catalyst for the protagonist's humanisation, which is a crucial aspect in the protagonist's process of change depicted in the novels.

I argue that the main female characters embody the fundamental human traits, such as individuality and emotions, and their effect on the protagonist is depicted as humanising. I also suggest that through the love-triangle setting the main female character, the eccentric Other, is contrasted with the woman of the dystopian norm, which foregrounds the main female character's humane features. Finally, I argue that the female characters of canonical literary dystopias are crucial

in the representation of hope both inside and outside the narrative, and thus, the representation of the main female characters contributes to the function of dystopian novels, namely warning about the possible inhuman future and giving hope of avoiding it.

In this section, I will discuss the background of dystopian literature and central elements concerning its narrative structure and function that enlighten the significance of utopian hope in dystopian literature**.** I will also briefly introduce my approach and methods of analysis. Then, in Sections 2 and 3, I will analyse the depiction of the main female characters in *We, Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, focusing on the aspects of humanisation arising from the texts, namely individuality reflected by distinct characteristics and intelligence, as well as sexuality and emotions. In *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, these aspects are foregrounded by the love-triangle setting. Finally, in Section 4, I will discuss the relation between the depiction and the role of female characters, humanisation and the representation of hope.

1.1. Literary dystopia in the utopian tradition: definitions, narrative and function

In this section, I will first define what I refer to as utopia and dystopia, and then move on to introduce some background for the emergence of literary dystopias as well as some relevant elements of literary dystopia's narrative structure and social function. Literary dystopias became prominent in the twentieth century and they were greatly influenced by the preceding utopian literature. Darko Suvin (2010) suggests that utopia can be defined as

> the construction of a particular community where sociopolitical institutions, norms, and relationships between people are organized according to a *radically different principle* than in the author's community; this construction is based on estrangement arising out of an alternative historical hypothesis; it is created by discontented social classes interested in otherness and change. All utopias involve people who radically suffer of the existing system and desire to radically change it. (p. 383)

Literary dystopias are a subgenre of utopian literature, and based on Suvin's definition of utopia, literary dystopias imagine a society organised according to a radically worse principle than in the author's reality, whereas eutopias are organised according to a radically better principle. 'Utopia', however, is often used as a synonym to eutopia (e.g., in Kumar (1987 and 1991), Clayes (2014) and Vieira (2014)). In this thesis, I will differentiate eutopia from utopia, as suggested by Suvin's definition, to make clearer distinctions between the elements that are typical for the depiction of ideal societies and those typical for the utopian tradition in general as well as to make clearer distinctions between their relations to dystopias or anti-utopias. When it comes to dystopias and anti-utopias, they

are usually used as synonyms. Furthermore, when they are not used as synonyms, their differences are not explicitly indicated, and there is no consensus on whether certain works, for instance, Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, are dystopias or anti-utopias. Here, I will use the term dystopia as an alternative to anti-utopia, if they are not specifically differentiated by the author, since they share the same background and only slightly differ in terms of typical elements if they are differentiated at all.

When it comes to the background of literary dystopias, their emergence is closely related to the contents of traditional eutopias and the precedent utopian literature in general. As Krishan Kumar (1987) suggests,

> It is [e]utopia that provides the positive content to which anti-utopia makes the negative response. Anti-utopia draws its material from [e]utopia and reassembles it in a manner that denies the affirmation of [e]utopia. (p. 100)

This view is relevant regarding the emergence of dystopias. According to Fátima Vieira (2014), it was the scepticism concerning the generally trusted human capacity to greatness that created the literary dystopias in the eighteenth century; some of the intellectuals questioned the faith in the humankind's greatness, which produced many satirical literary utopias depicting communities locating in places that could not exist or be reached because of biological and technological restrains (pp. 15–16). Satirical utopias, then, developed into dystopias or anti-utopias. Vieira (2014) suggests that whereas eutopia aimed to imagine a better social organisation, the anti-utopias of the eighteenth century ridiculed the utopian spirit itself, aiming to "denounce the irrelevance and inconsistency of [e]utopian dreaming and the ruin of society it might entail" (p. 16). Hence, dystopias emerged as a response to the visions of the ideal future and were characterised by scepticism towards the eutopian dreaming.

One, and possibly the most significant, example of the eutopia's influence on the development of dystopias concerns ideas of socialism, which were both an important factor in the revival of literary eutopias and the greatest catalyst for the emergence of dystopias following this revival. According to Kumar (1991), the socialist utopia greatly inspired literary eutopia at the end of the nineteenth century, and such works as Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, William Morris's *News from Nowhere* and H. G. Well's *A Modern Utopia* set socialism as the only seriously considered utopia from the point of view of utopian writers—a modern utopia (p. 62). Because of the spread of socialist ideas that seemed possible to put in practice as popular awareness of them increased, "the modern scientific and industrial utopia came to seem to many only too realizable and imminent", and therefore "anti-utopia concerned itself less with mockery and ridicule and sought instead to terrify and appal" (Kumar, 1991, p. 27).

Another significant element that shaped the dystopian turn in the last decades of the nineteenth century was eugenics, and together with socialism, it became a major theme in literary dystopias (Clayes, 2014, p. 111). The term 'eugenics' was coined by Francis Galton in 1883, and it referred to "the ability to produce superior offspring, with specific reference to humans rather than animal" (Sargent, 2010, p. 27). Eugenics developed two approaches of "improving the human stock", namely positive and negative eugenics that, respectively, used selective breeding either to gain certain characteristics or to avoid certain characteristics, both of which produced dystopias that concerned either the selected traits or worries about the "misuse of the power to make choices" (ibid.).

Both socialism and eugenics are also prominent themes in *We, Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, since the novels imagine totalitarian States that are to some extent built on an ideology resembling socialism and utilise genetic manipulation in creating optimal subjects for their needs. Although socialism and eugenics fed the dystopian discourse already at the end of the nineteenth century, it was the First World War that made dystopias truly emerge as, according to Gregory Clayes (2014), the Enlightenment optimism that valorised the progress of reason and science was "displaced by a sense of the incapacity of humanity to restrain its newly created destructive powers" (p. 107).

Besides the common themes, such as totalitarianism and eugenics, literary dystopias and eutopias share many structural elements due to their dialectic nature, and since they both are part of the utopian tradition. First of all, as Kumar (1991) points out, all literary utopias are works of narrative fiction:

> Utopia, then is first and foremost a work of imaginative fiction in which, unlike other such works, the central subject is the good society. This distinguishes it at the same time from other treatments of the good society, whether in myths of a Golden Age, beliefs in a coming millennium, or philosophical speculation on the ideal city. Fictive elements no doubt have their part to play in these modes but on none of them is narrative fiction, as in the utopia, the defining form. (p. 27)

Although Kumar uses utopia in reference to an ideal society, the same terms affect works of dystopias as well, and it is the fictional narrative that sets them apart from other speculations of worse social order. The traditional eutopian narrative was established by Thomas More in his *Utopia* (1516). The narrative is built around the protagonist's journey to an unknown place:

> […] once there, the utopian traveller is usually offered a guided tour of the society, and given an explanation of its social, political, economic and religious organization; this journey typically implies the return of the utopian traveller to his or her own country, in order to be able to take back the message that there are alternative and better ways of organizing the society. (Vieira, 2014, p. 7)

Suvin (2010) suggests that dislocation and the reference to author's reality represented by the protagonist's reality are crucial concepts in literary utopias, and he calls the genres utilising this kind of formal framework "estranged"; he argues that without the feedback to reader's normality, there would be no function for estranged genres, since the function of estrangement is to stand "on its head an already topsy-turvy or alienated world, which therefore becomes disalienated or truly normal when measured not by ephemeral historical norms of a particular civilization but by "species-specific" human norms" (p. 35). Estrangement is a crucial element in dystopias as well, although the methods they use are rather different.

Similarly to the works of traditional eutopia that share a similar narrative structure, the works of canonical dystopia have a typical narrative structure of their own; however, it differs from the eutopian narrative in various aspects. Whereas traditional eutopian narrative begins before the protagonist takes a trip to or accidentally arrives at the ideal place, literary dystopias begin directly in the terrible new world. According to Raffaella Baccolini and Tom Moylan (2003), dystopias establish the element of textual estrangement through focusing on the character questioning the dystopian society instead of physical dislocation like eutopias (p. 5). They argue that the dystopian text is built around the construction of a narrative of the hegemonic order and a counter-narrative of resistance: the counter-narrative develops as the protagonist starts to experience alienation and resistance, but in the beginning, the immediacy and normality of the location forestalls cognitive estrangement, portraying the protagonist as apparently content (ibid.). Martin Schäfer (1979), however, suggests that the basic structure of eutopia remains unchanged in dystopia, even though it does not imagine a traveller, but a resident of the dystopian society:

> […] the reader meets again a spokesman for his familiar values. Only this time the intellectual and emotional experience he is supposed to re-live runs the other way, not from sober doubt to utopian conviction but from utopian conformity to antiutopian non-conformism. (p. 287)

Nevertheless, Schäfer (1979) suggests that this changes the narrative "from static description to dynamic, conflict-ridden novel", which distinguishes the dystopia from eutopia by bringing the main conflict into the novel itself, "between the imagined world and the protagonist", instead of outside the novel as in eutopias, where the main conflict is "between the imagined and the real world" (p. 287). In eutopias, the focus is often on the depiction of the society and its organisation. Therefore, the traveller depicted in the eutopia is, as Schäfer (1979) suggests, "a traveling Everyman whose individual traits do not matter", but due to the change of conflict, the dystopian protagonist is "an individual with a relatively complex inner life, determined not by common sense but by contradictory impulses he does not himself understand" (p. 287). Both Schäfer's and Baccolini and Moylan's views on dystopian narrative are relevant and promote the conflict between the protagonist and the imagined

State, and into this conflict is integrated the implications of author's reality and reader's normality, which enables the effect of estrangement Suvin considers crucial for the genre of utopia.

Literary dystopias and eutopias are often contrasted with each other, since eutopias depict an ideal society and dystopias a perverted society, in addition to which dystopias are more dynamic and more concerned with the individual than the traditional eutopias that focus on the organisation of the society, which is emphasised by their differing narrative structures. Nevertheless, even though the contents of the literary eutopias seem opposite to those of dystopias, their intended function is similar, namely give hope for a better future; Baccolini and Moylan (2003) suggest that the function of the dystopian imagination is to warn people of horrible sociopolitical tendencies that could lead to society of "iron cages" portrayed in the dystopias (p. 2). Vieira (2014) suggests the same in spite of the negativity the dystopias often evoke in their readers:

> […] the readers are to understand that the depicted future is not reality but only a possibility that they have to learn to avoid. If dystopias provoke despair on the part of the reader, it is because their writers want their readers to take them as a serious menace; they differ, though, in intent, from apocalyptic writings that confront man with the horror of the end of the society and humanity. Dystopias that leave no room for hope do in fact fail in their mission. Their true vocation is to make man realize that, since it is impossible for him to build an ideal society, then he must be committed to the construction of a better one. (p. 17)

Hence, dystopias are not merely warnings about the potentially debased future; they aim to evoke agency in the readers and make them realise the crucial elements or values that help avoiding the dystopia. This positive message of dystopias is agreed upon by Lyman Tower Sargent (2010) as well, who referring to H.G. Wells' words suggests that dystopias say "that this is what will happen if we fail to act, but if we do act, this future can still be avoided" (p. 29). Therefore, despite the negative contents of dystopias, they aim to give the reader hope for the possibility of affecting the future and thus avoiding the dystopian society imagined by the author.

To summarise, literary dystopias are a subgenre of utopian literature that portray a radically worse community in comparison with the writer's reality. Dystopia has developed as a response to literary eutopia that imagines an ideal society, which is why they share many themes that have influenced their production, such as socialism (that in the case of dystopias has often developed into totalitarianism) and eugenics. As a genre, all utopian literature is characterised by estrangement that links the imagined society to the reader's normality, but eutopia and dystopia use different methods to create the effect of estrangement; whereas traditional eutopias use physical dislocation by picturing a traveller visiting the eutopia, dystopias take the perspective of a resident of the dystopian society, who finally realises the faults of the society by developing ideas and feelings that remind of the

reader's reality. The protagonist's process of enlightenment is also related to the counter-narrative of resistance, which is a central structure in a canonical dystopian novel. Due to the change in narrative, dystopias are more dynamic than traditional eutopias, and they are more concerned with the individual than eutopias that focus on the organisation of the society's everyday life on a more general level. Finally, literary eutopias and dystopias share a similar aim, namely giving the reader hope for a better future, which dystopias do by warning the reader about the possibility of inhuman future, but at the same time reminding that this terrible future can still be avoided, if the reader chooses to take action.

1.2. Analytical approach: analysis of narrative, genre and comparative analysis

In this thesis, I will use close reading as a technique to analyse the narrative of three dystopian novels: Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. My focus lies on the representation of the main female characters; therefore, I will analyse how the female characters are depicted in the texts through the descriptions of their appearances, intelligence, sexuality and feelings as well as through their influence on the protagonist's process of change, which is in the centre of the dystopian narrative. In this thesis, I use the term 'narrative' in reference to the sequence of actions, the plot, and the presentation of characters with their motives, aims, desires and characteristics in the text, which is a view influenced by the traditional definition of narrativity as suggested by Monika Fludernik (2009, p. 161). Since I will compare the representation of female characters in the three novels, I also use comparative analysis to illustrate a more general view on the canonical literary dystopias the works in question represent.

Besides the analysis of narrative and comparative analysis, genre is a central aspect in my thesis, since *We*, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* share many elements that are characteristic to the genre of literary dystopias, for instance, their narrative structure. John Frow (2015) suggests that genre "is a set of conventional and highly organised constraints on the production and interpretation of meaning", but he points out that genre is not only a restriction, even though it shapes the meaning; according to him, "Generic structure both enables and restricts meaning, and is a basic condition for meaning to take place" (p. 10). He considers genre as an aspect affecting interpretation rather than solely a means of classification, since genre defines "a set of expectations that guide our engagement with texts" (p. 113). Hence, even though genre can be used in classifying different texts, it also helps the process of interpretation, since it defines the expectations related to the work of a specific genre.

In the section above, I discussed the genre of literary dystopias as part of the utopian tradition to demonstrate the similarities and differences between the literary dystopias and eutopias, which

helps to understand the typical elements of the canonical literary dystopias written during the first half of the twentieth century. Briefly, as a genre, literary dystopias are characterised by the presentation of a debased society, which is introduced from the perspective of a local resident who, as the narrative proceeds, realises the horrors of the society and finally acts against the State power, which creates the counter-narrative of resistance and the effect of estrangement. Although genre is often defined by form and common themes, Carolyn R. Miller (1984) suggests that "a rhetorically sound definition of genre must be centered not on the substance or the form of discourse but on the action it is used to accomplish" (p. 151). Miller's perspective is that of rhetorical theory, but her view on genre seems useful also in the case of literary dystopias, since whereas the themes and form of dystopias may vary, their function remains the same; namely, they are designed to give the reader hope for the future by warning about the harmful tendencies of the present that may lead to a dystopia and by reminding that the inhuman future can still be avoided. Thus, Miller's idea of foregrounding the aspect of social action in defining genre is relevant to my topic, since I discuss the representation of female characters in relation to the representation of this utopian hope, which is a crucial characteristic of the literary dystopia as part of the genre of utopian literature. Therefore, defining literary dystopia as a genre provides the framework for my analysis of the female characters' relation to the typical elements of literary dystopias, and in this thesis, specifically of their relation to the representation of utopian hope.

Through comparative analysis, as mentioned, I aim to illustrate a more general view on the female characters' function in a canonical dystopian novel. *We*, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are the best-known examples of canonical dystopias of the twentieth century, which is why I chose them as the objects of analysis for this thesis, even though they have been discussed and analysed various times after their publishing. However, they are rarely analysed from the perspective of female characters or with the emphasis on practical analysis, both of which are part of my approach to the novels. By comparing the depictions of the main female characters as well as the elements of the novels' narratives related to these depictions, I aim to point out the similarities between the function of female characters in terms of the representation of hope in the dystopian novels in question. Nevertheless, I will also identify some differences, thus demonstrating that despite the similar themes, settings and narrative structures, the meaning of the texts can be rather different in the end, even though they share the same aim as a warning about the terrible future.

All in all, I use the methods of close reading to conduct practical analysis of narrative and comparative analysis of three dystopian novels: Zamyatin's *We*, Huxley's *Brave New World* and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Genre provides the framework for my research, since my focus is on the typical elements of literary dystopias with the emphasis on the representation of utopian hope,

which is related to the common function of literary dystopias, namely giving the reader hope of avoiding the terrible future depicted in the text. Furthermore, I utilise, for instance, the approach of sensory studies, namely, how vision is used in the narrative to reveal the truth represented by a woman, in the discussion to achieve a broader understanding of the topic.

2. Characteristics and intelligence of a woman: Other's individuality in the State of conformity

As discussed in Introduction, since literary dystopias are often intended as a response to literary eutopias, they share common themes. One of these themes is the strict conformity controlled by the State depicted in many dystopian fictions, such as in *We, Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, in which it is closely related to the representation of the main female characters. According to Fátima Vieira (2014), utopian societies often have a rigid set of rules designed to "force the individuals to repress their unreliable and unstable nature and put on a more convenient social cloak" due to writers' distrust in individuals' capacity to live together (p. 7). With its strict rules, the imagined utopian society often promotes the State over the individual. The rules promoting the State at the expense of the individual create a conflict between the individual freedom and the advantage of the society, which is presented in both classical eutopias and dystopias, although from different perspectives; in classical eutopias, the result of prioritising the State is often positive, and they imagine a harmonious society, whereas in dystopias it takes forms of systematic repression and totalitarianism. Krishan Kumar (1991) suggests that dramatizing these conflicts of the society is the essence of utopian literature:

> Utopia, of course, aspires to overcome these contradictions, to show how the circle can be squared. In doing this what it often reveals is the price to be paid for following one or other principle to its logical extreme. […] by the very idealism of its attempt to resolve the dilemmas of modern society it dramatizes them in a vivid and highly effective form. (p. 51)

Hence, both literary eutopias and literary dystopias present the extreme of the possible solution to the contradiction between the social stability and individual freedom. Whereas in literary utopias the solution is celebrated, literary dystopias often reverse the perspective by presenting the same solution as totalitarian or in some other way inhuman.

According to Vieira (2014), totalitarianism is one of the two intimately connected ideas that have inspired dystopian discourse, the other being "the idea of scientific and technological progress which, instead of impelling humanity to prosper, has sometimes been instrumental in the establishment of dictatorships" (p. 18). *We*, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* all depict a totalitarian State where technological progress and propaganda are used to turn people into non-distinct masses since individuality is considered a threat to the society. Frederick Jameson (2007) suggests that it is typical for modern anti-utopias to picture a system that "develops its own instinct for self-presentation and learns ruthlessly to eliminate anything menacing its continuing existence without regard for individual life" (p. 205). This is the case in canonical literary dystopias that imagine

a strict State control that prevents people from breaking its norms partially by eliminating those that do. Similarly to eutopia, the dystopian society is in a sense perfected, but as Kumar (1987) states, its focus is on the perfect control:

> But while the [e]utopian order was *perfect*, in the moral sense, the anti-utopian order was merely *perfected*, in the social sense. It was the dreadful perfection of some modern system or idea. And while [e]utopian societies were *ideal*, in the sense of the best possible, anti-utopian society represented merely the victory or tyranny of the *idea*. (p. 125)

In essence, the dystopian society is strictly organised, and the idea the society is based on is practiced in its most extreme form, which results in the repression of individuals.

In the States depicted in literary dystopias, it is typical to dehumanise the citizens by describing them as a homogenic mass in which individual has no personal value. According to Scott Sanders (1977), the "disappearance of character" is a typical and relevant theme in the genre of science fiction, in which literary utopias are often included:

> Science fiction reproduces the experience of living in a regimented, rationalized society, within which the individual has become anonymous: persons are interchangeable, relating to each other through socially-defined roles; actions are governed by procedure, and thus do not characterize the actor; emotion is repressed in favor of reason; the individual is subordinated to the system. (p. 14)

Although Sanders refers to science fiction in general, this kind of loss of individuality is depicted in the societies described in literary dystopias: individuals have a certain role they need to play as part of the State machine, but they have no value or personality besides this role. This loss of identity seems to be connected to the change of focus from the social organisation depicted in eutopia to the individual in literary dystopia as suggested by Martin Schäfer (1979): since the individual is in the centre of the conflict depicted in a dystopia, the focus of the critique, the problem illustrated in the novel, changes from the "prerequisites of social justice" to "those of psychic wholeness for the individual"; therefore, although the dystopian society is in a sense perfected like the eutopian society, it is depicted as an "inhuman State of "reason"" (p. 292). Based on Schäfer's view, dystopias hence criticise the dehumanisation conducted by the State, and the focus is similar to the loss of identity suggested by Sanders.

The loss of identity and the idea of promoting the State at the expense of individuality is a significant aspect of dehumanisation depicted in canonical literary dystopias. The control over the individuals is in *We*, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* achieved by what Kumar calls, as referred to above, the "tyranny of the idea", since the State controllers are depicted as implementing certain ideologies to their extreme. Renata Reich (2012) discusses dehumanisation in relation to

ideological enforcement in the context of *Brave New World*, and referring to Herbert Kelman's suggestion, Reich defines identity and community as "two criteria by which we categorize persons as being human" (p. 38). By identity, Reich (2012) refers to "the perception of a person as being different from others, capable of making his own choices", and by community to "the perception of the other as part of a social network formed by individuals who perceive other individuals and themselves as belonging to the same network and who acknowledge the fact that each individual within the network is unique" (pp. 38–39). In the dystopian community, the ideology implemented by the State removes the uniqueness and value of the individual altogether by reducing them to replaceable parts of the society by annihilating feelings and free will, which aligns with Sanders' notion of loss of character in the twentieth century science fiction novel. Thus, in the dystopian society, both identity and community, as defined by Reich, are absent, which dehumanises the society. In this kind of dystopian society, where the right to make choices is removed from the individuals, thus removing their identity as well, a human becomes a heretic, a criminal; it is possible to re-establish one's identity, the ability to make choices, only by breaking the norms of the society

Hence, the canonical dystopian novels usually depict a society that has a rigid set of rules that are designed to erase individuality and create dehumanised masses of citizens. The States depicted in canonical dystopias are often totalitarian and they rely on science to control people as in *We, Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The loss of individuals and dehumanisation are related to the enforcement of ideology in the dystopian novels, and hence the described societies are characterised by perfected social order and the tyranny of the idea that form the basis of the State control. As mentioned in the previous section, the typical elements of dehumanisation in *We, Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, namely the control of thought and actions through technology and strict State laws, are challenged by eccentric female characters. In this section, I will analyse the ways the female characters are depicted in the texts as individuals by focusing on their general characteristics and intelligence that characterise their relation to the norms of the dystopian society the authors have depicted in their novels.

2.1. General characteristics of a dystopian woman and the Other: femininity and association with nature

In the dystopian societies depicted in *We*, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, there are strict State laws and norms designed to restrict individuality; as a result, the citizens are depicted as collective masses. In Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We* and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the dystopian women are represented by the protagonist's original partner, whereas the dystopian norm

is challenged by the eccentric female Other. As mentioned in Introduction, these three characters form a love-triangle, in which the female characters contrast each other.

In *We*, all descriptions of the society and its people are presented from the perspective of the first person narrator, a man called Δ-503, who attempts to record everything as truthfully as possible in his diary that forms the narrative of the novel. The woman of a dystopian norm in the novel is O-90 who is Δ-503's sexual partner. O-90 is the closest we can get to a regular woman of the society, although she is not depicted as standardised as the One State's norms would suggest: she is characterised by a strong need to be a mother, even though she is shorter than required by the Maternal Norm and hence denied the possibility. O-90 also has intense feelings of affection towards Δ-503 even though significant emotional bonds between people—or numbers, as the One State refers to its citizens—should not exist. These characteristics of O-90 make her appear not as an ideal woman of the society, but it may be that most women of this dystopian society are not ideal in terms of the One State's ideology. For instance, the inspector of Δ-503's apartment building, a woman called ЮО-, is also described as being attached to Δ-503; she protects him and the Other, I-330, from the State although they are criminals, only to avoid Δ-503's anger and disappointment in her. Thus, she acts against the State's norms. Hence, it is possible that O-90 truly represents a regular woman of the society, which indicates that the One State is depicted as a society that has not yet reached its utopia.

O-90, the regular dystopian woman, is contrasted with the eccentric female Other, I-330. One of the features reflecting their differences is the description of their eyes. O-90 is described as having "round, crystalline-blue eyes" that are "not spoilt by one little cloud" (Zamyatin, 2017, p. 10). In the One State, everything is made of glass, which makes everything transparent, thus implying the fundamental idea of the State that privacy should not exist since there are no individuals. It also indicates the omnipresence of State power, since everything the citizens do can be easily monitored by the State authorities and other citizens. Similarly to the One State's glass buildings, O-90 is transparent as her clear eyes indicate, and she is thus connected to the State's norm, representing the stable, unfree society Δ-503 wants to believe in despite meeting I-330. I-330's eyes, on the other hand, are described as "lowered – like blinds", which indicates that Δ-503 cannot be sure of her intentions (p. 27). In addition, I-330's depiction as opaque instead of transparent like everything in the One State should be indicates that she is somehow rebellious and thus dangerous to the State. Furthermore, her eyes reflect something uncontrollable:

> Before me were two horribly dark windows, and inside, such an unknown, alien life. I could see only fire – she had a sort of "fireplace" of her own blazing there […]. (pp. 28–29)

Δ-503, who is still depicted as strongly believing in the One State and has not questioned any of its norms, is scared by the opaqueness of I-330's eyes, as they are not made transparent by the State's

conformity of thought, but instead reflect something as wild and profound to the ancient human development as fire. Hence, the descriptions of the two main female characters' eyes effectively contrast O-90 with I-330 and represent their relation to the One State's fundamental norms that are based on transparency.

Besides the descriptions of the I-330's and O-90's eyes, the effect these female characters are depicted to have on Δ-503 indicates the connection that O-90 has with the dystopian norm and I-330's potentially dangerous eccentricity in comparison to it. After the first private meeting between Δ-503 and I-330, Δ-503 is described as feeling uneasy as he battles between reporting her to the authorities for using a fake sickness certification and an unexplainable reluctance to do it; not reporting I-330 would make Δ-503 a criminal, and after all, he is a model citizen who is proud of the One State's rigid organisation. Nevertheless, meeting I-330 is described as reviving Δ-503's thoughts about the irrational root, $\sqrt{-1}$, that made no sense to him in the One State where rationality is one of the basic norms: "This irrational root grew into me, like something alien, foreign, terrible, it devoured me – it was impossible to make sense of it, render it harmless, because it was beyond *ratio*" (Zamyatin, 2017, p. 39). But when Δ-503 runs into O-90 and watches the "tiny droplets of sunshine in her blue eyes", he is "warmed up somehow, recovered; $\sqrt{-1}$ had subsided, wasn't stirring…" (p. 42). The dangerous irrationality that has started stirring after Δ-503 met I-330 is forgotten with O-90, whose presence makes him comfortable and makes him trust in the State's idea that everything is rational, transparent and clear as O-90's eyes. Thus, whereas O-90 is depicted as safe and easy to read, I-330 is depicted as mysterious, slightly dangerous and uncontrollable. Since Δ-503 is described as feeling comfortable with O-90, she represents the dystopian norm Δ-503 is used to, whereas his uneasiness with I-330 indicates I-330's otherness.

The representations of O-90 as a sincere dystopian citizen and I-330 as a mysterious, potentially dangerous individual are indicated by the descriptions of their eyes; O-90's crystalline, blue, transparent eyes are contrasted by I-330's opaque eyes that reflect blazing fire. These representations are supported by the descriptions of the general appearances of the two women: O-90 is described as "all roundly smoothed off" and "composed wholly of circles", thus she is soft and round as her name, whereas I-330 is "slim, sharp, persistently supple, like a whip"— like the letter 'I' in her name (Zamyatin, 2017, p. 6, p. 9, p. 8). Furthermore, the description of I-330's face foregrounds the sharpness of her features:

> […] dark eyebrows jerked up high by her temples, and a mocking, sharp triangle with the apex turned upwards – two deep lines from the nose to the corners of the mouth. And these two triangles somehow contradicted one another, put on her face as a whole that unpleasant, irritating X – like a cross: a face crossed out. (p. 52)

Associating I-330's face with triangles gives an expression of her face as being full of angles, and thus she is an opposite to O-90's roundness, which highlights her eccentricity. In addition, Δ-503 sees an irritating X, which for the mathematician Δ-503 represents an unknown variable, therefore reflecting his insecurity and confusion with I-330. Furthermore, since it seems like I-330's face is crossed out, she represents something new and potentially dangerous as she is not defined by the One State like others, she cannot be 'solved'. With the X, I-330 herself becomes the unknown variable, which explains why Δ-503 is depicted as feeling uncomfortable but still intrigued by her. Thus, the descriptions of I-330's opaque eyes and sharp, X-shaped facial features represent her as mysterious and dangerous, which is foregrounded by the contrast created by the descriptions of soft, safe and transparent O-90.

Hence, I-330 and O-90 are contrasted by the descriptions of their eyes and general features. Δ-503 is described as feeling comfortable with O-90 and uneasy with I-330, based on which O-90 represents the dystopian norm that Δ-503 is used to and I-330 the eccentric, potentially dangerous otherness. In addition to having the features that contrast I-330 with O-90, I-330 is depicted as having habits that distinguish her from the other citizens of the dystopian norm as well. One and the most emphasised of these habits is wearing old-fashioned clothing from the time before the One State was established. In the One State, people do not have names; instead, they are asserted a specific numeral code, "the state number", and they wear "pale-bluish unifs with gold number plated on their chests", which is a concrete sign of their depiction as masses (Zamyatin, 2017, p. 7). I-330's individuality in terms of clothing is presented in three scenes. In the first scene, it is described how I-330 performs music of ancient times as part of a presentation in an auditorium, and therefore she is "wearing the fantastic costume of an ancient era: a tight-fitting black dress; sharply emphasized was the whiteness of her bare shoulders and chest, and that warm shadow that heaved with her breathing between…" (p. 18). Then, in the second scene, I-330 changes her uniform into "a short, old-fashioned, bright-yellow dress, a black hat, black stockings", and through the light silk Δ-503 "could clearly see: very long stockings, well above the knee, and the open neck, the shadow between…" (p. 29). Both times, Δ-503 is described as focusing on the shadow between I-330's breasts, which indicates that the old-fashioned clothing I-330 prefers to wear is more revealing and highlights her femininity in comparison to the uniforms. In the third scene, Δ-503 hears I-330 undressing her uniform:

> I turned around. She was wearing a light, saffron-yellow dress of an ancient pattern. This was a thousand times more vicious than if she had been wearing nothing. Two sharp points through the fine fabric – two coals of smouldering pink through ash. (p. 54)

Here, I-330 is once again sexualised through her clothing, and wearing this kind of partly revealing clothing of ancient times is regarded as more provoking and as a more serious violation of the

dystopian norm than being naked since it reminds of the time before the present State power. Thus, descriptions of I-330 wearing revealing, old-fashioned women's clothing serves to highlight her femininity in comparison with the other women in the novel and imply her disregard for the State's norms.

A similar indication concerning women's clothing is depicted in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* with Julia. As in Zamyatin's One State, in Orwell's Oceania people must wear specific uniforms, which contributes to their representation as masses instead of separable individuals. All regular members of the Party are described as wearing blue overalls, whereas the inner Party members wear black ones. Besides increasing conformity, it seems that the wearing of overalls is intended to restrict women's femininity in the society depicted in the novel, since it is implied that the Party's focus on restriction of sexuality concerns especially female citizens. This is presented by Julia's view on clothing, since she is described as desiring to be more feminine when spending time with Winston in their hideout:

> I'm going to get hold of a real woman's frock from somewhere and wear it instead of these bloody trousers. I'll wear silk stockings and high-heeled shoes! In this room I'm going to be a woman, not a Party comrade. (Orwell, 1977, p. 142)

Based on this, the overalls are associated with the restriction of Julia's femininity, as she contrasts being a Party comrade with being a woman. Femininity is also restricted by not allowing the Party women wear any makeup, which is indicated by depicting Winston's surprise when he sees Julia wearing some:

> He turned round, and for a second almost failed to recognize her. What he had actually expected was to see her naked. But she was not naked. The transformation that had happened was much more surprising than that. She had painted her face. […] He had never before seen or imagined a woman of the Party with cosmetics on her face. The improvement in her appearance was startling. With just a few dabs of color in the right places she had become not only very much prettier, but, above all, far more feminine. (p. 142)

Even though Winston is not used to naked Party women since anything to do with female sexuality is strictly forbidden, he is still described as considering it more shocking that Julia, or any Party woman, wears makeup. In addition, it is described how cosmetics have considerably improved Julia's appearance and made her look more feminine, which is emphasised. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that both restrictions on clothing and wearing makeup are meant to restrain femininity, and thus Julia's attempt to be more feminine distinguishes her from the dystopian norm and promotes her individuality.

The repression of femininity by forbidding certain types of clothing and cosmetics traditionally associated with women seems to be typical element in utopian literature: besides *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, for instance, in Tommaso Campanella's *City of the Sun* (1602), women share many occupations with men and are similarly trained, but it is punishable by death to wear high heels or makeup (Baruch, 1991, p. 188). This also gives an example of relation between literary dystopia and literary eutopia, since the elements meant to be celebrated in the ideal society in Campanella are integrated into the dystopias of Zamyatin and Orwell.

So far I have discussed the general representation of women and the Other in *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, which are rather similar in the sense that both have a male protagonist that is involved in a love-triangle with two women: already in the beginning he has a relationship with a woman that represents the dystopian norm and he then meets the eccentric female Other who is a complete opposite to the norm and thus represents the eutopian possibility to the protagonist. In *We*, the Other, I-330, is mysterious, dangerous and sharp in comparison to round, soft and transparent O-90. Both Zamyatin's I-330 and Orwell's Julia are depicted as more feminine than the standardised women of the societies, which is indicated by describing them to prefer old-fashioned women's clothing, and in Julia's case wearing makeup, that highlights their femininity, which like individuality, is restricted by the mandatory use of uniforms. Old-fashioned clothing also represents the time before the establishment of the dystopian State power, which indicates that I-330 and Julia are willing to oppose the present State. In these aspects, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* does not share many common features with the two novels, as the love-triangle setting is not as significant. Nevertheless, the society depicted in the novel is characterised by rigid conformity as in the other two dystopias.

The society imagined in *Brave New World* differs from the other two in the sense that it consciously creates an inequal society by using genetic manipulation to breed people into five castes of different level of physical and psychological ability to make them suitable for different purposes, these castes being Alphas, Betas, Deltas, Gammas and Epsilons. There is little genetic variation within a caste, especially in the lower ones, which are produced by Bokanovsky's process, namely, by dividing a single egg into nearly a hundred. The Bokanovsky's process is referred to as "one of the major instruments of social stability", since it produces "standard men and women; in uniform batches" (Huxley, 2004, p. 5). Hence, the society does not try to achieve a state of equality, or sameness, as in *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*—of course, also in these there are more privileged groups, but they are marginal and consist of those in power—but it provides what the State considers equal happiness to all through genetic and psychological conditioning, as suggested by the Director of the Hatcheries in the novel:

> […] that is the secret of happiness and virtue – liking what you've *got* to do. All conditioning aims at that: making people like their unescapable social destiny. (p. 12)

Thus, the State is described as programming it citizens both genetically and psychologically to fulfil certain tasks, and besides these tasks, people have no other function than consuming drugs, other goods and various services; due to conditioning, however, they do not wish for anything else and are therefore happy and content with their lives. As Krishan Kumar (1987) notes in relation to the society depicted in *Brave New World*, "individual development is abolished – individuals are frozen for the whole of their lives by their genetic and social conditioning", which results in the abolishment of social development (p. 259). This is the brave new world's guarantee for stability in the society.

In *Brave New World*, people are depicted as vain since they are conditioned to detest ugliness and consume as much as possible, which is applied to goods but also to people as sexual products. The only character described as radically different from the general norms of the society is John the Savage, who has lived in the Reservation before coming to the civilised brave new world and thus has avoided genetic engineering and conditioning. He is repulsed by the dozens of identical citizens of the lower castes and thinks that consumerism has gone too far in the brave new world, since everything is just handed to people and relationships are based on having whomever one likes whenever one likes without the sense of gain; according to John, "nothing costs enough here" (Huxley, 2004, p. 211). John is described as feeling the need to prove himself to be worthy of Lenina, which contrasts him with Bernard, who is first depicted as seeking a true emotional bond with Lenina, but when he gains his new status by 'showcasing' John, the uncivilised savage, he exploits the possibility to have any woman he likes. Thus, the love-triangle between Lenina, Bernard, and John is the one that functions to contrast the dystopian norm with the eccentric Other, John.

Lenina, however, is from John's perspective contrasted with Linda, his mother, who represents the past in the Reservation. First, Lenina is depicted as the eccentric Other that holds the promise of a better future to John, who has not been accepted as a full member of the community in the Reservation. Her beauty is contrasted with Linda's ugliness, and she is depicted as the reason why John is so eager to leave to the civilised world. In the end, however, Lenina's and Linda's roles are reversed, as the new world turns out to be against everything John believes in. As Linda dies and John finally realises that Lenina cannot be anything else but a woman of the dystopian norm, it is Linda's memory John chooses to cherish since it is related to their old life in the Reservation—the life that John now yearns for. Thus, the representations of the two women contrast the new world with the old one, but this time in the favour of the old, as John finds a brief happiness by moving away from the city into the lighthouse surrounded by nature to recreate his life in the Reservation.

As John moves away from the city, nature becomes his eutopia, and he associates it with Linda and their past in the Reservation. This kind of yearning for nature and the old times is depicted in all three novels discussed. In *Brave New World*, nature is part of John's past as well as his future eutopia, and it is closely related to Linda, his mother, who raised him and loved him—at least in John's mind. Similarly, in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Julia is associated with nature and the good old times together with Winston's mother. First, it is described how Winston dreams about the "Golden Country" he possibly visited with his mother as a child, and there he meets Julia who throws away her overalls and thus discards the Party's ideology (Orwell, 1977, p. 31). Then, Winston and Julia's first private meeting place is described as a natural clearing surrounded by tall saplings that isolated the from the society controlled by the Party. Thus, nature is represented as their haven, their private eutopia. Nature is hence connected to Winston's memories of her mother and the time before the Party's control, as well as to his and Julia's rebellion against the State. Associating Julia with nature makes her wild and uncontrollable in comparison with the regular Party women who live their lives mostly in the industrialised city. In addition, similarly to describing Julia as wanting to wear old-fashioned women's clothing and look like the women of the past, associating Julia with nature connects her representation with the representation of the past, which also implies that Julia offers Winston a warm and safe relationship as nature and the past are strongly related to the depiction of his mother.

Of the women of the three dystopias, I-330's association with nature is emphasised the most. In *We*, it is described how the One State is cut out from all nature by a Green Wall, which is made of glass. Once walking by the Wall, Δ-503 sees an animal staring at him behind it with yellow eyes, and later realises that they look the same as I-330's:

> […] she's slowly drawing me inside her through the narrow golden windows of her pupils. […] And for some reason I recall how I once also looked through the Green Wall into some creature's incomprehensible yellow pupils, […]. (Zamyatin, 2017, p. 142).

Yellow eyes are one of the two features that make I-330 seem animalistic, the other being her "dazzling, almost cruel teeth" that Δ-503 is often described to focus on, and her smile is referred to as a bite (p. 18). Giving I-330 animalistic features associates her with nature, but also contributes to her depiction as a dangerous and unpredictable Other.

Finally, it is also revealed that I-330 and the other rebels come from behind the Green Wall and attempt to change the State. It is described how I-330 takes Δ-503 outside the Wall, where he is overwhelmed by his first experience with nature:

> The sun… this was not our sun, evenly distributed over the mirrored surface of the roadways: these were living slivers of some kind, incessantly leaping spots, which dazzled your eyes and made your head spin. And the trees, like candles – right into the sky; like spiders squatting

> low to the ground on gnarled paws; like mute green fountains… And it's all crawling, stirring, rustling, from under my feet some sort of bristly little ball shies away, but I'm riveted to the spot, I can't move a step, because under my feet it isn't a plane – you understand, not a plane – but something repulsively soft, pliant, living, green, elastic. (Zamyatin, 2017, pp. 149–150)

The experience is intense and both intrigues and scares Δ-503, which is very similar to his experience with I-330, who is depicted as wild and free, not restricted by the State like nature cannot be truly restricted by glass. The connection to nature equals also the connection to the ancient times before the One State, when people lived from the land, free and together with animals. This connection to the past is supported by I-330's clothing, similarly to Julia, and I-330 and Δ-503's meetings in the Ancient House, which is left in the state before the revolution. The past and nature are both irrational in terms of the rational One State, and thus also I-330 is depicted as irrational and rebelling against the State's norms. Also, the rebellious side of Δ-503 is connected to nature and the past through his shaggy hands that come to represent his other, jealous, loving, and rebellious self, which is discussed in the next section.

2.2. Intelligence and political engagement in the society of conditioning and propaganda

As mentioned, the societies presented in canonical dystopian novels are typically built on conformity and equal treatment of all; equal in the sense that people are treated as an inseparable mass without individual identities, thus erasing the value of an individual and transferring the idea of mass-production from products to people. In *We*, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the authors present societies that practice genetic engineering to some extent. The most radical example is imagined in *Brave New World*, where Huxley describes how people are manufactured artificially in incubators where they grow in bottles and move along the conveyor belt with their physical abilities moderated until they are decanted. In Zamyatin's One State depicted in *We*, there are laws that define Maternal and Paternal Norms that deny the possibility of procreation from those who do not meet the Norms, and in Orwell's Oceania in *Nineteen Eighty-Four,* procreation is the only function of marriage, which is controlled by the Party by approving only marriages it considers suitable based on its own norms. These three dystopian societies are also depicted as relying heavily on psychological conditioning and propaganda in producing masses of citizens that are completely controlled by the State. As a result, the citizen of a dystopian norm lacks individual thought and personal identity and hence is loyal to the State. Therefore, individual thought and rebellious actions are significant aspects of the Other since they make her appear more humane and individual than the preconditioned citizens

of the dystopia. Hence, Other's individuality contributes to her humanisation, and her ability to think outside the State's norms is also described as affecting the protagonist's process of humanisation.

Of the three dystopian societies in question, least value to the individual is given in Zamyatin's One State, although the State's mechanisms of creating the masses is not revealed to the same extent as in *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. As mentioned in the previous section, citizens of the One State do not have names, only numeral codes assigned to them, and they are referred to as numbers, which dehumanises them. One example of depicting the numbers as replaceable parts instead of individuals is presented in the scene where it is described how during the testing of a spaceship engine, ten people standing under it are burned to death, and the protagonist, Δ-503, records "with pride that the rhythm of our work didn't falter because of this for a second, nobody flinched", and everything continued "as if nothing had happened" (Zamyatin, 2017, p. 104). Hence, there are no unique individuals, only replaceable parts of the State machine, whose value is based solely on their usefulness to the community. The society is described as thriving in the state of "unfreedom", and except for two hours per day, the Tablet of Hours controls the mass of citizens:

> Each morning, with six-wheeled precision, at one and the same hour and at one and the same minute – we, the millions, rise as one. At one and the same hour, uni-millionly, we start work – uni-millionly we end. And merging into a single, million-armed body, at one and the same second, designated by the Tablet, we lift our spoons to our mouths […]. (p. 13)

Therefore, the rhythm of the day is described as the same for each number, and the conformity is taken as far as to give each citizen only a two-hour slot per day to choose freely what to do. Numbers are required to work and educate themselves so that they are of most use to the One State. One of the first things we learn about the Other of *We*, I-330, is that she disregards her duty to the State as she uses false sickness certificates to avoid working or attending the lectures during the communal hours. Thus, she is depicted as a criminal who neglects the communal routine and steals her work from the One State.

The most significant features contributing to I-330's individuality described in the text are her intelligence and rebellious thoughts. Whereas the woman presenting the dystopian norm, O-90, is portrayed as simple-minded and lacking the capacity to complex thought in comparison to Δ-503, I-330 makes Δ-503 uncomfortable with her knowledge. As discussed in the previous section, O-90 is depicted as safe and transparent. In addition, it is indicated that Δ-503 associates her with a helpless child in intellectual sense:

> […] the pink O – her mouth – is open to catch my every word. And also: the round, chubby little crease on her wrist – children sometimes have them. (Zamyatin, 2017, p. 6)

Contrasting O-90 with a child depicts her as intelligently inferior to Δ-503, and she appears ready to accept everything he says to her. Right after this description, Δ-503 tells her about his "formula" about the perfect harmony of people and machinery alike, which is due to the unfree movement, similar to a dance:

> "It's wonderful. Isn't it?" I asked.
>
> "Yes, wonderful. It's spring," O-90 smiled at me pinkly.
>
> Well, there, if you please: spring… She's on about spring.
>
> Women… I fell silent. (p. 6)

Thus, O-90 is depicted as ignoring the profound thoughts on the perfect society, or as not understanding them, and Δ-503 as considering her lack of intelligence typical for women. Nevertheless, this does not bother Δ-503 but instead is described as making him feel safe and at home in the civilised society, even when I-330 has already affected his mental stability:

> O-90 sat over an exercise book with her head bent towards her left shoulder and her tongue stuck up against the inside of her left cheek from the effort. This was so childlike, so enchanting. And everything inside me was so good, exact, simple… (p. 38)

The childlikeness of O-90 also implies that Δ-503 is depicted as superior to her. Furthermore, description of O-90's eyes indicate her lack of intelligence and original thought: "blue eyes are wide open to me – blue windows to the inside – and I penetrate to the inside without getting caught on anything: there is nothing inside, i.e. nothing extraneous, unnecessary" (p. 37). Once again, O-90's eyes are depicted as transparent, this time by using a metaphor of a window. It is added, however, that there is nothing unnecessary behind her eyes; in essence, O-90 does not have unorthodox ideas that confuse Δ-503, and he does not need to question her intentions, since they align with the norm.

Hence, O-90 is associated with a child and depicted as simple by describing her as disregarding Δ-503's philosophical thoughts and by referring to her eyes as transparent windows behind which there is nothing unnecessary, in essence, nothing that differs from the norm of the One State. Due to her simplicity and childlikeness, Δ-503 is depicted as intellectually superior to her, and therefore O-90 represents stability and makes Δ-503 feel safe by not forcing him to question the norms of the society he adores. Nevertheless, Δ-503 is depicted as fascinated by I-330, even though he is described as feeling insecure with her. For instance, in the Ancient House, where Δ-503 and I-330 meet privately for the first time, it is described how I-330 seems to read his mind, leaving him confused:

> She was somehow speaking out of me, speaking my thoughts. But all the time in her smile there was that irritating X. There, behind the blinds, there was something happening inside

her – I don't know what – that was making me exasperated; I wanted to argue with her, shout at her (exactly that), but I had to agree – it was impossible not to. (Zamyatin, 2017, p. 28)

I-330 says things that agree with the State's norms, and thus with Δ-503's norms as well, but her smile and hidden eyes make Δ-503 suspicious of her, although in the One State there should be no reason to assume that someone would think differently or have hidden intentions. Therefore, Δ-503 is depicted as confused and uncomfortable since the moment he meets I-330. Her superiority to Δ-503 is also demonstrated by describing how she nullifies his devotion to the State's norms by laughing at him, when he intensively agrees with her about the State's procedures—the procedures of "we":

"[…] But you know, in essence, they [the artists of the past] were rulers more powerful than their crowned heads. Why didn't they isolate, destroy them? We…"

"Yes, we…" I began. And suddenly – she burst out laughing. And I could actually see that laughter with my eyes: the curve of that laughter, resonant, abrupt, supple and elastic, like a whip. (p. 30)

I-330's laughter is associated with a whip, which implies that Δ-503 realises the mocking tone of her laughter, that she has unorthodox intentions and tries to play some sort of mind games with him, but it also indicates the superior status of I-330, since whip represents dominance. This kind of discourse, where I-330 lures Δ-503 to verbalise his pro-State thoughts that are the result of conditioning, and then she either laughs at him or contradicts his logic, leaving him confused, forms most of their encounters described in the text. Hence, I-330's intelligence and hidden intentions are described as having an opposite effect on Δ-503 in comparison with O-90, who is depicted as simple as a child. Therefore, in his relationship with O-90, Δ-503 has a status as the intellectual one, whereas with I-330 he is described as submitting under her undeniable superiority.

The Other of *We*, I-330, is the leader of the revolution that aims to take over the One State, and she is depicted intellectually superior to the protagonist, Δ-503: in the dialogue, I-330 is described as laughing at Δ-503's enthusiasm to agree with the One State's norms, and she teaches him about the past and what she thinks is the truth behind the happiness promised by their State. I-330's intelligence is described as making Δ-503 uncomfortable and confused, whereas the regular dystopian woman, O-90, is portrayed as simple and childlike, which is described as making Δ-503 feel safe and stable in contrast with the unnerving new sensations caused by I-330. Depicting I-330 as an intelligent woman with original ideas in the State that is built on conformity and where knowledge is controlled by the State contributes to her portrayal as an individual. Original thought is a humanising feature that distinguishes the Other from the dystopian norm also in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, where Julia is described as capable of seeing through the State's propaganda. However, whereas I-330's rebelliousness is based on the political engagement, Julia's is related to her selfishness in comparison

with the regular Party women. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, all Party women are described as unintelligent and without a will of their own. This dystopian norm is represented by Winston's wife, Katharine, who is described as

> a tall, fair-haired girl, very straight, with splendid movements. She had a bold, aquiline face, a face that one might have called noble until one discovered that there was as nearly as possible nothing behind it. (Orwell, 1977, p. 66)

Thus, it is Katharine's lack of intelligence that is implied to be the reason why Winston considers her unattractive. It is told that Winston even nicknamed her as "the human sound track" since

> she had without exception the most stupid, vulgar, empty mind that he had ever encountered. She had not a thought in her head that was not a slogan, and there was no imbecility, absolutely none, that she was not capable of swallowing if the Party handed it out to her. (p. 66)

This also indicates that Winston's rebellious ideas had already emerged when he was with Katharine, and therefore Katharine's blind belief in Party's ideology annoyed him.

As a complete opposite to the regular Party women, who are described as loyal Party members who believe in everything the Party says to the extent that they are incapable of having original ideas, enters Julia, who despite being a member of the Party, is depicted as pursuing the individual freedom the Party is depicted as denying from its members. Whereas the regular Party women are presented as passive or docile, Julia is depicted as active and rebellious, although she fakes being a perfect Party woman. Julia's view on life is described as circling around her own needs, and she actively, though covertly, resists Party's rules if they limit her possibilities to enjoy life:

> Life as she saw it was quite simple. You wanted a good time; "they," meaning the Party, wanted to stop you having it; you broke the rules as best you could. She seemed to think it just as natural that "they" should want to rob you of your pleasures as that you should want to avoid being caught. She hated the Party, and said so in the crudest words, but she made no general criticism of it. Except where it touched upon her own life she had no interest in Party doctrine. (Orwell, 1977, p. 131)

Describing Julia as selfish in this sense contrasts her with other Party women who are presented as dedicating themselves to the Party. Julia's idea of opposing the Party, however, is also different from Winston's idea, since he wishes to make a slow but permanent change in the world through a more overt revolution. Julia, on the other hand, is described as disregarding this kind of resistance:

> Any kind of organized revolt against the Party, which was bound to be a failure, struck her as stupid. The clever thing was to break the rules and stay alive all the same. (p. 131)

Thus, Julia is not depicted as someone who pursues a permanent change in the society. Instead, her selfish view on life is what distinguishes her from the other citizens of dystopia and contrasts her with

Katharine in terms of intelligence, since unlike her and the other standardised Party women, Julia does not dedicate herself to the Party's ideology, but prioritises her own personal life. Julia's selfishness can be summarised in her reply to Winston, who tells her about his wish to encourage the future generations to rebel so that the Party could be defeated: "I'm not interested in the next generation, dear. I'm interested in *us*" (p. 156, emphasis in original).

Julia is depicted as covertly opposing the Party in order to gain more individual freedom and enjoy life to the fullest, but at the same time as uninterested in bringing this freedom to everyone. Her lack of interest in the full-scale revolution is what most clearly distinguishes her from Zamyatin's I-330. Although Julia is described as thinking that openly resisting the Party is futile, she is also depicted as determined to live life to the fullest as long as possible, whereas Winston thinks "that from the moment of declaring war in the Party it was better to think of yourself as a corpse" (Orwell, 1977, p. 135). Winston's idea thus contradicts Julia's view on life:

> "We're not dead yet," said Julia prosaically.
>
> "Not physically. Six months, a year—five years, conceivably. […] Obviously we shall put it off as long as we can. But it makes very little difference. So long as human beings stay human, death and life are the same thing."
>
> "Oh, rubbish! Which would you sooner sleep with, me or a skeleton? Don't you enjoy being alive? Don't you like feeling: This is me, this is my hand, this is my leg, I'm real, I'm solid, I'm alive! […]" (p. 136)

Whereas most Party members are depicted as masses that care only about the communal life that serves the Party and the State, Julia is described as unwilling to resign her individuality. Even though Julia joins the revolution with Winston in the end, it is indicated that she is still motivated by her own interests, namely the opportunity of making life more enjoyable by trying to ensure the continuation of her and Winston's relationship, whereas Winston is depicted as prepared to devote himself to the cause of making a change in the society in the same way as regular Party members are depicted as devoting themselves to serving the Party.

Hence, Julia is described as devoted in making her own life more enjoyable instead of complying with the Party's ideology that other citizens, especially women, are depicted as following to the extent that they have no interest in their personal life as long as they fulfil their duty to the Party, which foregrounds Julia's ability to think for herself. The depiction of Julia as capable of having original ideas is supported by presenting her as somewhat immune to the State's propaganda as an opposite to Katharine, who as a "human soundtrack" repeated everything that Party stated as an absolute truth. For instance, it is told that Julia is always fighting laughter during propaganda films presented as part of Two Minutes Hate, which is designed to provoke anger in citizens and direct it

towards the enemies of the State. Also, it is described how Julia does not believe the Party's information concerning the on-going war:

> […] she startled him by saying casually that in her opinion the war was not happening. The rocket bombs which fell daily on London were probably fired by the Government of Oceania itself, "just to keep people frightened." This was an idea that had literally never occurred to him [Winston]. (Orwell, 1977, p. 153)

Thus, Julia presents an idea that Winston has never thought of himself, even though he is also depicted as immune to the Party propaganda. But even though Julia is depicted as rather unsusceptible to propaganda, she does not question the Party's ideology and teachings when they do not concern her own life, and for instance, she shocks Winston by admitting that she cannot remember that four years before Oceania had not been at war with Eurasia but with Eastasia instead, since the war was always going on all the same (p. 154).

Thus, Julia is represented as an intelligent female character, since she is depicted as prioritising her own needs over the Party's and as having her own thoughts on life and the society instead of being affected by the Party's propaganda that the standardised citizens, the masses, are depicted as believing. Whereas the masses are depicted as happy to resign their individuality and devote themselves to the State's cause, Julia is described as an individual, who has her own goals and motives, which makes her appear more human than the dystopian citizens.

In *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, both Zamyatin and Orwell imagine an intelligent female character, the Other, who is contrasted with the female character representing the dystopian norm. In *We*, I-330 is the leader of a revolution, who is depicted as intelligently superior to the protagonist, Δ-503; it is described how she makes him confused and laughs at his thoughts that align with the One State's ideology. I-330 is contrasted by Δ-503's original sexual partner, O-90, who, on the other hand, is depicted as simple and childlike, which is described as reassuring Δ-503 since he does not need to question her logic that aligns with the State's norms. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Julia is depicted as intelligently distinct in comparison with the regular citizens, especially women, by presenting her as clinging to her personal identity instead of devoting herself to the Party, in addition to which she is not prepared to sacrifice herself for the freedom of the future generations like Winston. Julia is contrasted with Winston's wife, Katharine, who is described as believing everything the Party states and as unable to have thoughts or ideas that are not generated by the Party. Julia, on the other hand, is mostly immune to the Party's propaganda, as she is described as criticising the Party's actions and ideology. Although the significant aspects of I-330's and Julia's intelligence are different, in both cases, intelligence contributes to their depiction as individuals instead of as part of the masses; thus, it is a humanising feature in the dystopian societies where the State controls the thoughts of its citizens

through propaganda and authorities such as Guardians and Thought Police, as imagined by Zamyatin and Orwell.

Although in *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* the State is depicted as controlling its citizens and turning them into collective masses that are treated as replaceable parts of a machine instead of valuable individuals, in Huxley's *Brave New World* people are depicted as having even fewer opportunities for individual thought due to genetic engineering and systematic conditioning, and unlike *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the novel lacks an intelligent female character. In *Brave New World*, it is depicted how all citizens of civilised London, except for some Alphas, are engineered so that they are incapable of original thought, which is considered fundamental for ensuring the social stability. Huxley describes how hypnopaedia, verbal sleep conditioning, is used to teach people to be fully content with their role in the society and understand the need for every caste while respecting the higher ones and detesting the lower ones. Besides the social status, people are taught the morals of the society through hypnopaedia by filling their minds with suggestions and slogans such as "Everybody belongs to everyone else", "Ending is better than mending", and "sterilization is civilization". As a result, people's minds are completely moulded by the State, as told by the Director of the Hatcheries in the text:

> Till at last the child's mind *is* these suggestions, and the sum of the suggestions *is* the child's mind. And not the child's mind only. The adult's mind too – all his life long. […] But all these suggestions are *our* suggestions! (Huxley, 2004, p. 23, emphasis in original)

The slogans designed by the State can be used by the dystopian citizens as a response to any situation, and hence there is no need or room for original thought. As Krishan Kumar (1987) states, the slogans aim to eliminate "all thought and disturbing reflection with a comforting assurance" (p. 257).

The use of slogans that demonstrates the incapability to have original ideas is depicted as a characteristic of both Lenina and Linda, who are the most significant female characters in the novel. Lenina, who is a Gamma, is described as constantly quoting the slogans she is conditioned to believe, and they are enough of an explanation to her no matter the case. Linda, for her part, is a Beta and has lived with the Savages for more than a decade, is also described as still clinging to the same slogans and therefore unable to understand, for instance, the concept of marriage. Depiction of Linda's reliance on slogans after being completely cut out of the civilised world for more than a decade demonstrates the power the conditioning is depicted as having on the citizens of the brave new world.

In addition to assuring slogans, it is depicted how citizens are kept mentally docile with *soma,* which is "the perfect drug" that can be used to "Take a holiday whenever you like, and come back without so much as a headache or a mythology" (Huxley, 2004, p. 46). With *soma,* people can avoid strong feelings and unpleasant thoughts, which is the final guarantee of peaceful society. Both Lenina

and Linda are depicted as dependent on *soma* in controlling their emotions and thoughts, which aligns with the dystopian norm of the novel's society. For instance, in the scene where Lenina and Bernard are arriving to the Reservation, the Warden tells Lenina about the savages, but thanks to *soma*, Lenina "could now sit, serenely, not listening, thinking of nothing at all", only commenting "You don't say so" when there was a dramatic pause (pp. 87–88). Thus, *soma* is described as promoting passive behaviour and reducing the cognitive abilities of its user. When it comes to Linda, it is described how she could not use *soma* in the Reservation and ended up using alcohol instead to numb her feelings; therefore, "The return to civilization was for her the return to *soma*, was the possibility of lying in bed and taking holiday after holiday" (p. 133). Instead of people that shared her values, she is depicted as having missed the perfect drug that gave her access to another, truly happy reality with complete idleness, which demonstrates the power the drug is depicted as having in the novel's society. Nevertheless, none of the main male characters is described as actively using *soma*: Bernard mostly avoids it, but ends up taking it from time to time to control his feelings; Bernard's Alpha-friend, Helmholtz, does not use *soma*, as he does not feel like needing it; finally, John does not take *soma* since he does not want to be enslaved by it like Linda, who finally dies because of it. Therefore, it is the men of the *Brave New World* whose intelligence and individuality are highlighted by depicting them as refusing *soma*, the most powerful agent of conformity in the society on which the standardised citizens depend.

Thus, the women of the brave new world are depicted as slaves to *soma* and the learnt slogans. Therefore, both Linda and Lenina represent the dystopian norm in this sense, and hence, there are no intelligent women presented in the novel unlike in *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Even though it is described how Linda educated John about the civilised world and taught him to read when he was a child, the intelligence of a female character neither affects the man's view about the State in the novel, nor does it distinguish the female Other from the dystopian norm—this is reserved for the male characters instead. When it comes to the male protagonists, their intelligence seems to be of more importance than Lenina's, and both John and Bernard are depicted as intellectually superior to her. For instance, it is described how Lenina is unable to respond to Bernard's attempts of getting her to think outside the State's norms:

> "Don't you wish you were free, Lenina?"
>
> "I don't know what you mean. I am free. Free to have the most wonderful time. Everybody's happy nowadays."
>
> He laughed, "Yes, "Everybody's happy nowadays." We begin giving the children that at five. But wouldn't you like to be free to be happy in some other way, Lenina? In your own way, for example; not in everybody else's way."

"I don't know what you mean," she repeated. (Huxley, 2004, p. 79)

Lenina cannot understand Bernard, since she can only think in terms of her conditioning, and instead of trying to understand, she repeats the slogans and simply states that she does not understand him. Besides being unable to understand, Lenina is described as refusing to think anything that does not agree with the norms: as Bernard "began to talk a lot of incomprehensible and dangerous nonsense", she "did her best to stop the ears of her mind" (pp. 80–81). Although Lenina realises the danger, it is most likely due to the conditioning as well, since the regular citizens are conditioned to think only in terms of the suggestions incepted by the State; thus, rest is defined as incomprehensible and unacceptable. Nevertheless, Lenina is somewhat eccentric, as will be discussed in the following section, and thus she might be able to realise the danger of unorthodox ideas on her own. Mostly, however, Lenina is depicted as able to think only in the form of the learnt slogans and other morals taught by the State, and when unorthodox ideas are presented, she simply refuses to hear, whereas Bernard is described as openly speaking about his unorthodox thoughts and patronising Lenina for using the slogans he knows are the result of hypnopaedia.

Thus, Bernard is described as making Lenina confused and anxious with his thoughts that do not align with the dystopian norm in which Lenina is psychologically engineered to believe. The same confusion, accompanied with annoyance, is described again in the dialogue with John, in which he tries to explain to Lenina his feelings and his wish to get married:

> "How much I love you, Lenina," he brought out almost desperately.
>
> An emblem of the inner tide of startled elation, the blood rushed up into Lenina's cheeks.
>
> "Do you mean it, John?"
>
> "But I hadn't meant to say so," cried the Savage, clasping his hands in a kind of agony. "Not until… Listen, Lenina; in Malpais people get married."
>
> "Get what?" The irritation had begun to creep back into her voice. What was he talking about now?
>
> "For always. They make a promise to live together for always."
>
> "What a horrible idea!" Lenina was genuinely shocked.
>
> "Outliving beauty's outward, with a mind that doth renew swifter than blood decays."
>
> "*What?*"
>
> "It's like that in Shakespeare too. "If thou dost break her virgin knot before all sanctimonius ceremonies may with full and holy rite…""
>
> "For Ford's sake, John, talk sense. I can't understand a word you say. […]" (pp. 167–168, emphasis in original)

John is depicted as using various examples, concepts and language that are unfamiliar to the people of the brave new world; for instance, he cites Shakespeare and talks about marriage. Hence, Lenina has no means of understanding John, which once again foregrounds her depiction as an unintelligent female character, who cannot think outside the dystopian norms of the society that are engraved into citizens by conditioning. John, on the other hand, is described as different from the citizens of the dystopian norm; he has not been conditioned by the State, and is therefore able to think freely, which is not possible to the most civilised citizens. Furthermore, he is described as using old language written by Shakespeare, whose works among everything old are forbidden in this dystopian society, which foregrounds his individuality and associates him with the past. Nevertheless, although the men of the love-triangle differ from the dystopian norm in terms of intelligence, it does not affect Lenina's humanisation, since at the end of the narrative, she is still able to think only in terms of the conditioning she has received. Hence, in *Brave New World*, intelligence does not contribute to humanisation, as in *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, where I-330's and Julia's intelligence is depicted as affecting the protagonist's ability to question the dystopian society and think outside its norms, which humanises him.

To summarise, the dystopian societies imagined in *We*, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* have in common their attempt to restrict individuality and turn their citizens into collective masses by using genetical engineering, conditioning, propaganda and State authorities that monitor citizens. The aim is a totalitarian utopia, where individuals are like replaceable machine parts that have specific functions that contribute to the State's progress. In Zamyatin's *We* and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the eccentric female Other is depicted as different from the dystopian norm represented by the protagonist's original partner. The love-triangle setting contrasts the two female characters and foregrounds the Other's individuality and the dystopian features of the original woman.

The general characteristics and the intelligence of the Other depicts her as an individual who has a possibility to make her own choices, which is not possible for the standardised dystopian citizens depicted in the novels. Thus, the depiction of the main female character as an intelligent individual, who is different from others in the society where everyone should be the same, and who acts against the norms of the society, humanises her when reflecting on Herbert Kelman's criteria of categorising someone as human discussed earlier in this section. Kelman suggests that identity is one of the two central criteria in this categorisation; as defined by Reich (2012), identity refers to being different from others and being capable of making choices. Hence, the main female characters of *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are depicted as having a personal identity unlike the regular citizens depicted in these dystopias, which makes them more human. In the dystopian society, the individuals are

deprived of their individual differences and possibility to make choices, which is why the act of resisting the dystopian norm is crucial for the humanisation in the canonical dystopian novels. Besides the political engagement and criticising the State, resistance in the novels in question is related to the depictions of characters' sexuality and emotions, as will be discussed in the following section.

3. Sexuality and emotions as aspects of humanisation in the dystopian narrative

In the previous section, I analysed how the Other is depicted as an individual with a personal identity, since she is different from the dystopian norm and is able to make her own choices, whereas the regular citizens of the dystopian societies are depicted as collective masses programmed by the State. The main female characters of Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We* and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are given features that distinguish them from the dystopian norm in terms of intelligence and general characteristics as well as by associating them with nature and past. Also, in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, a female character, namely John's mother, Linda, is associated with nature, but otherwise, the novel lacks an eccentric female character depicted as intelligently superior to the dystopian norm of a woman. However, besides intelligence and general characteristics, sexuality and emotions are significant aspects of the depiction of female characters in the three novels and they are closely related to the protagonist's process of humanisation which is central to the dystopian narrative.

Sexuality and powerful emotions are crucial aspects of resistance of the dystopian norm in all three novels, and their denial is a typical element in utopian literature. According to Elaine Baruch (1991),

> Most utopias are anti-sex, and, if not that, then anti-erotic. Even when they allow promiscuity, they do so to reduce the claims of passion against the state. (p. 211)

Hence, most societies depicted in classical utopias restrict sexuality or allow promiscuity to keep the citizens docile. In eutopias, this is celebrated, whereas in dystopias it is considered oppressive. Also, in the canonical dystopias discussed in this thesis, the treatment of sexuality is described as a political technique with which the State attempts to make its citizens docile. Although the treatment of sexuality varies between the societies depicted in the three novels from strict chastity to required promiscuity, depicting the Other and the protagonist as breaking the dystopian norm of sexuality contributes to the authenticity of their relationship, and the sexual act itself is represented as a concrete and powerful act of resistance.

Despite the different approaches to sexuality, in all three novels emotions are considered a threat to the State power, which is why citizens are not supposed to have or show strong feelings unless they are intentionally triggered by the State; as Scott Sanders (1977) suggests, in dystopian society "emotion is repressed in favour of reason" (p. 14). Hence, natural and personal emotions should not exist in the dystopian societies depicted by Zamyatin, Huxley and Orwell. However, in each novel, the Other triggers a process of emotional growth in the protagonist, making him—or in the case of *Brave New World*, her—more human. The eccentricity of the relationship with the Other is contrasted by the relationship of a dystopian norm, and thus the humane aspects of the relationship

and Other's eccentricity are emphasised. In this section, I will analyse the representation of female characters in terms of sexuality and emotions and how their depiction is once again contrasted with the depiction of a dystopian norm. In addition, I will examine the protagonist's process of humanisation from the perspective of sexuality and emotions, since it reflects the depiction of female characters' effect on the protagonist.

3.1. Sexuality: sex instinct and a relationship escaping the State's control

In *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, sexuality is foregrounded as an important aspect of the protagonist's relationship with the Other, and it is also connected to the rebellion against the state power. In Zamyatin's One State depicted in *We*, the sexual act is controlled by the State:

> […] it's a matter of technology. You're analysed thoroughly in the Sexual Bureau's laboratories, they determine precisely the sex hormone content in the blood and draw up a corresponding Table of sexual days for you. Then you make a statement to the effect that on your days you wish to make use of such and such a number (or numbers) and you receive the appropriate booklet of coupons (pink). That's all there is to it. (Zamyatin, 2017, p. 22)

The tickets mentioned in the citations are used to get a certificate for the right to blinds from the building's inspector on sexual days, since the walls are made of glass. Partners have 15 minutes, after which the blinds must be opened again. Outside these occasions, sexual interaction is denied. All numbers can freely choose their sexual partner from the other numbers, and one can have several partners assigned to them at the same time: according to the *Lex sexualis* established by the One State, "Every number has the right to any other number as a sexual product" (p. 22). This kind of assigned sexual partnership forms the basis of the relationship between the protagonist, Δ-503, and the standardised dystopian woman, O-90, although they are described as spending time together in other ways as well, for instance, by going on walks and solving math puzzles, which indicates that they enjoy each other's company.

Δ-503's relationship with I-330, on the other hand, is contrasted with that with O-90 by depicting it as breaking the State's norms through sexual acts that take place outside State's control and by transforming rational Δ-503 into an irrational animal. Based on the above description of Δ-503's view on the One State's procedures concerning sex, he is depicted as agreeing with the State's rationality in the beginning of the narrative, and he does not appear to attach any feelings to the sexual act; fully understanding the State's procedure he is depicted as content with it. Nevertheless, after I-330, the eccentric significant Other, is introduced to the reader, it is depicted how Δ-503's rationality is slowly erased as the narrative proceeds, and he ends up breaking the laws of the State. It is described

how during Δ-503 and I-330's second private meeting, Δ-503 develops a separate animalistic identity driven by jealousy and sex instinct:

> There were two Is. One I was the former one, Δ-503, number Δ-503, while the other one… He'd only stuck his shaggy paws a little way out of the shell before, but now the whole of him was climbing out, the shell was cracking, at any moment now it would smash to bits and… and what then?
>
> […]
>
> And the other one suddenly jumped out and yelled:
>
> "I won't allow it! I don't want anyone but me… I'll kill anyone who… Because it's you I – it's you I…"
>
> I saw: he grabbed her roughly with his shaggy paws, tore her fine silk, sank his teeth in – I remember it precisely: specifically his teeth.
>
> I don't know how now, but I- slipped away. […]
>
> I remember: I was on the floor with my arms around her legs, kissing her knees. And I was begging: "Now – right now – this very minute…" (Zamyatin, 2017, pp. 56–57)

Δ-503's other identity is described as violent and having animalistic features such as shaggy paws, and it is driven by sex instinct and jealousy instead of rationality characteristic to him. Soon after this scene, it is described how I-330 and Δ-503 use false sickness certifications to go to the Ancient House, and even though Δ-503 recognises that he is a thief stealing his work from the One State, he feels I-330's touch in his hands and on his lips and realises it is "a necessity" (p. 72). Thus, he is depicted as prioritising I-330 over the State due to sexual appeal. In the Ancient House, they perform the sexual act for the first time, and since it is during the communal hours and not on a sexual day, they break the law. Thus, Δ-503's relationship with I-330 is depicted as resistance of the State power. Furthermore, their relationship promotes the sex instinct as a fundamental human trait that cannot be rationalised or controlled by the State power.

Similarly to I-330's old-fashioned clothing discussed in Section 2, the uncontrolled sexual act between Δ-503 and I-330 is associated with the time before the revolution that established the One State. Δ-503 and I-330's first sexual act takes place in the Ancient House, which is an apartment building left into the state before the civilised era of the One State. The moment is described as a burst of colours and passion:

> The heavy, creaking, opaque door closed, and straight away my heart opened painfully wide – wider still: it was fully open. Her lips – mine, I was drinking, drinking, tearing myself away, gazing silently into eyes thrown wide open to me – and again.

> The semi-darkness of the rooms, blue, saffron-yellow, the dark-green morocco, the golden smile of the Buddha, the glimmering of mirrors. […]
>
> It was ripe. And inevitably, like the iron and the magnet, with sweet submissiveness to the strict, immutable law, I poured myself into her. There was no pink coupon, there was no calculation, there was no One State, there was no me. There were only tenderly sharp, clenched teeth, there were golden eyes thrown wide open to me – and through them I slowly entered in, ever deeper. (Zamyatin, 2017, p. 73)

Bright colours and the opaqueness of the Ancient House represent the ancient times since everything in the modern society of the One State is made of colourless glass, and the opaque door concretely separates them from the State's control. In the paragraph above, these elements therefore intensify the passion that the standardised citizens of the One State should not feel when it comes to sex and relationships. Furthermore, the immediacy and passion of the encounter is emphasised by short clauses and listing, which creates a rapid sequence of sensations. "The strict, immutable law" refers to the animalistic sex instinct instead of the One State's laws, as Δ-503 is described as giving in to the sensation, the primal instinct, to the extent that he discards the norms of the State and loses himself into the animalistic I-330, who is represented by sharp teeth and golden eyes that are later associated with the eyes of an animal behind the Green Wall. Δ-503's relationship with I-330 is depicted purely sexual for his part, but this relationship is still depicted stronger than his relationship with O-90: for Δ-503, it is "all the same" that his relationship with O-90 ends because of I-330, even though she had been the closest person to him for years (p. 77). Thus, the uncontrollable sex instinct is portrayed as a more powerful force than a loving relationship approved by the State; it is irrational and authentic since it is not based on the One State's rational policies, which makes it a humanising feature.

Sexuality, and particularly the sex instinct, is represented as an uncontrollable human trait that contributes to the depiction of uncontrollability of Δ-503 and I-330's relationship. In Zamyatin's One State, sexuality is scientifically defined and controlled by the State, which also makes the free sexual act an act of resisting the State power. Furthermore, I-330's sexual rebelliousness is depicted as the most significant factor affecting Δ-503's transformation from a State-loving rational scientist to a confused criminal, who battles between his sexual needs and devotion to the State to the extent that he develops a second, passionate and irrational identity. I-330 is depicted as opposing the sexual norms of the One State since it is emphasised how the sexual encounters between her and Δ-503 take place outside the restrictions of sexual days: the one time that Δ-503 visits I-330 on the sexual day with a pink coupon, she refuses to have sex, and as she assigns herself to Δ-503, she never visits him; she only tells him to close the blinds on sexual days to fool the Guardians.

According to Elaine Baruch (1991), I-330 "represents freedom from the state but erotic enslavement" (p. 210). This seems accurate; while it is described how Δ-503 slips from the norms of the One State, it is also described how he becomes increasingly desperate for I-330's attention:

> Closer – she leant her shoulder against me – and we are one, there's a flow from her to me – and I know: this is a necessity. I know with every nerve, every hair, every painfully sweet beat of my heart. And it's such a joy to submit to this "necessity". (Zamyatin, 2017, p. 70)

Thus, the romantic relationship with I-330 is depicted as Δ-503's priority, and it is described how he needs her touch after she has revealed to him the passionate sensations that the One State had erased. Δ-503 is willing to become a criminal to keep I-330 by his side, and although recognising his dependence on her, he is content with his new role: "yes, I'm a slave, and that's a necessity too, that's good too" (p. 71). This erotic enslavement, however, represents authenticity and hope of achieving something that is not controlled by the State; something personal instead of collective feelings and goals assigned by the State. It is outside State's control and based on "ancient" humanity characterised by strong irrational feelings and passion. Darko Suvin (2010) suggests that

> [Zamyatin's] aim is to show a sincere believer turned inside out by *what is missing* in the Unique State: the pleasure of the senses, a feedback loop between the brain and sexual *jouissance*, the colours, tastes, smells, and hormonal delights experienced by his body, an eversion that would translate as a subversion. (p. 350, emphasis in original)

I-330 is described as providing these missing elements of the dystopian society, but she represents hope more to the reader than hope to the protagonist inside the novel, since Δ-503 is mostly depicted as confused and reluctant to resist the dystopian State and as a slave to the sex instinct I-330 triggered and he cannot control.

Thus, I-330 is depicted as opposing the One State's norm of sexuality, which is based on a completely scientific and rational process. In addition, the sexual act is separated from passion, which the State aims to erase. I-330's sexuality is described as crucially affecting the protagonist, Δ-503, who develops a separate identity characterised by jealousy, violence, animalistic features and uncontrollable sex instinct that represents the fundamental human traits that reflect authenticity and individuality. Therefore, the uncontrollable sexual acts between Δ-503 and I-330 described in the text are presented as a means to weaken the State power. In *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, besides sexuality, emotions are in a significant role when it comes to the descriptions of the female characters and of the protagonist's struggles and process of humanisation. In *We*, however, it is the primal sex instinct that is depicted as the greatest weakness of the dystopian State power and the proof of individuality and authenticity.

In terms of the representation of sexuality, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is rather similar to *We*, and the described sexual acts between Winston and Julia serve the same function as between Δ-503 and I-330; they represent a concrete act of resistance of the State's control. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, however, this function is emphasised, since Winston and Julia are described as consciously using the sexual act as a means of resisting the Party unlike in *We*, where Δ-503 is depicted reluctant to oppose the One State but unable to fight his primal sex instinct.

The perspective to female characters presented in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is similar to that in *We,* as the novel's narrative consists of Winston's views and experiences. Nevertheless, whereas in *We* and *Brave New World* the standardised women are depicted attractive and approachable, in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* they are cold and treacherous. Winston is depicted as considering women untrustworthy due to their loyalty to the State:

> He disliked nearly all women, and especially the young and pretty ones. It was always the women, and above all the young ones, who were the most bigoted adherents of the Party, the swallowers of slogans, the amateur spies and nosers-out of unorthodoxy. (Orwell, 1977, p. 10)

Based on this, Winston considers women the most enthusiastic supporters of the Party, who believe everything the Party says and are prepared to report anything suspicious, which makes them treacherous to Winston, who despises the Party. With Julia, Winston is also described as thinking the worst at first: when Winston notices her following him, he instantly thinks she might be one of the Thought Police and is prepared to kill her to stop her from reporting him. Besides women's loyalty to the Party, Winston's sexual frustration is described as influencing his contempt toward women, which is indicated by his thoughts on Julia before properly meeting her:

> He hated her because she was young and pretty and sexless, because he wanted to go to bed with her and would never do so, because round her sweet supple waist, which seemed to ask you to encircle it with your arm, there was only the odious scarlet sash, aggressive symbol of chastity. (p. 15)

Hence, Winston's dislike is described as being based on Julia's attractiveness. Woman's attractiveness and Winston's sexual frustration related to it seems to be a crucial aspect of Winston's depicted hatred towards women: the more attractive the woman is, especially if she is young, the more Winston wants her and the more unlikely it is that he could have her, as in the Julia's case above; the scarlet sash is the sign of the Junior Anti-Sex League that promotes the idea of abolishing the sexual act altogether. Depiction of Winston's sexual frustration as the source of his hatred toward women is supported by how quickly, almost instantly after receiving the note from Julia that says "I

love you", he is described as deciding that Julia can be trusted and feeling affectionate of her, even though not long ago it was described how he was prepared to smash her head with a stone.

Thus, Winston is depicted as suspicious of women due to their loyalty to the Party and as sexually frustrated, which also represents his frustration with the Party's ideology in general since the Party forbids sexual interaction between Party members unless they are married; the promiscuity between Party members is referred to as "the unforgivable crime" (Orwell, 1977, p. 65). According to the Party's doctrine, divorce is forbidden as well, but the Party "encouraged separation in cases where there were no children" (p. 66). This is presented as the reason for Winston and his wife's, Katharine's, separation. Katharine represents the dystopian woman in the novel, and it is indicated that she is the original reason behind Winston's contempt toward women and his sexual frustration, since she is described as detesting sex:

> As soon as he touched her she seemed to wince and stiffen. To embrace her was like embracing a jointed wooden image. And what was strange was that even when she was clasping him against her he had the feeling that she was simultaneously pushing him away with all her strength. The rigidity of her muscles managed to convey that impression. She would lie there with shut eyes, neither resisting nor co-operating, but *submitting*. It was extraordinarily embarrassing and, after a while, horrible. (pp. 66–67, emphasis in original)

Katharine is thus described as being repulsed by the physical contact with Winston. Nevertheless, it is told that as Winston had suggested a celibate, Katharine refused since trying to conceive a child was their "duty to the Party" (p. 67). In the end, however, Katharine moved away. This depicts Katharine as a thoroughly devoted Party woman, who puts Party's requirements over Winston, since she does not have feelings of affection toward him.

Winston's wife, Katharine, is thus described as hating the physical contact with her husband and as a thoroughly loyal Party member who only tries to fulfil her "duty to the Party", which is why she represents the dystopian norm in terms of sexuality. In the text, the doctrines concerning sexuality are presented as important aspects of Party's control over its members, and through propaganda, the Party is depicted as promoting the idea that procreation is the only function of sexual act and aiming to remove all pleasure from it:

> The aim of the Party was not merely to prevent men and women from forming loyalties which it might not be able to control. Its real, undeclared purpose was to remove all pleasure from the sexual act. Not love so much as eroticism was the enemy, inside marriage as well as outside it. All marriages between Party members had to be approved by a committee appointed for the purpose, and […] permission was always refused if the couple concerned gave the impression of being physically attracted to one another. The only recognized purpose of

> marriage was to beget children for the service of the Party. Sexual intercourse was to be looked on a slightly disgusting minor operation, like having an enema. […] The Party was trying to kill the sex instinct, or, if it could not be killed, then to distort it and dirty it. (Orwell, 1977, pp. 65–66)

Hence, the Party is described as considering the sexual activity itself a threat, not only the bonds people may build, which is presented as its motive to control sexual freedom of the Party members.

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four,* the Party is depicted as controlling the marriage between its members, forbidding promiscuity and using propaganda to remove all pleasure from sex and reduce it to a means of procreation: it is described how the idea of sex as "a slightly disgusting minor operation" is indirectly "rubbed into every Party member from childhood onwards", and "There were even organizations such as the Junior Anti-Sex League which advocated complete celibacy for both sexes" (Orwell, 1977, p. 65). In addition, especially girls and women are the target of Party's propaganda, as they have

> Sex talks once a month for the over-sixteens. And in the Youth Movement. They rub it into you for years. (p. 132)

This is how women of the Party learn that the only function of a sexual act is procreation, which is "the duty to the Party", which, as suggested by Blu Tirohl (2000), "underlines the redirection of motivation for procreation away from pleasure and toward sustaining the Party" (p. 57). Thus, restricted sexuality is depicted as the most significant characteristic of a dutiful Party woman like Katharine, who represents the dystopian norm of a woman in *Nineteen Eighty-Four.* Julia, on the other hand, is depicted as seeking individual freedom and trying to make life enjoyable by covertly breaking the rules of the Party instead of devoting herself to the Party's cause, as discussed in Section 2. The depiction of Julia's relation to her sexuality supports her characterisation as the eccentric female Other, who wants to enjoy her life in her own terms, as an individual, and it is the most emphasised difference between the depictions of Julia and Katharine. According to the dystopian norm depicted in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, restricting one's sexuality and detesting the sexual act form the basis of women's loyalty to the Party. It is described how Julia, on the other hand, adores sex and has done it several times and always with a Party member, even though it is strictly forbidden outside marriage. Therefore, Julia is depicted as immune to the Party's propaganda and as putting her own sexual needs over the Party's doctrines of procreation and marriage.

As mentioned above, the Party is depicted as controlling the sexual freedom of its members because it considers it a threat to its power; through the use of propaganda, it aims to remove pleasure from the sexual act and promotes procreation as the only reason for sex. Julia is described as enjoying

the sexual act, which makes her the eccentric Other Winston needs to break the norms of the society, since Winston is depicted as considering the sexual act a powerful act of resistance:

> […] what he wanted more even than to be loved, was to break down that wall of virtue, even if it were only once in his whole life. The sexual act, successfully performed, was rebellion. Desire was thoughtcrime. (Orwell, 1977, p. 68)

Thus, Winston is described as recognising the status of sex as an uncontrollable act of resistance, and his desire to oppose the State is linked to his sexual frustration. It is described how also for Julia sexual freedom is the key to the individual freedom and the most efficient way of opposing the Party. In fact, sexual freedom is emphasised in Julia's characterisation, since she is depicted as disregarding the idea of making a change in the society; it is even described how Winston says that Julia is "only a rebel from the waist down", which she gladly approves: "She thought it was brilliantly witty and flung her arms round him in delight" (p. 156). In his novel, Orwell thus connects the sexual freedom with the individual's freedom from the totalitarian State power. Cass R. Sunstein (2005) suggests that Orwell's point in the novel "has to do with how sexuality is connected with individuality and self-expression, with the rejection of conformity, with what he seems to see as the truest and most distinctive self, anarchic and not governable" (p. 239). Julia's depiction supports this claim since her sexuality is the most distinctive trait that distinguishes her from the conformal Party women depicted as complying with the dystopian norm, and her sexuality is also depicted as the demonstration of her individual freedom and resistance of the Party's control.

The main idea behind the Party's restriction of sexual freedom is presented in the novel by Julia, who brings it to Winston's knowledge, which promotes her depiction as an intelligent female character. First, it is mentioned "that the sex instinct created a world of its own which was outside the Party's control and which therefore had to be destroyed if possible", but even more importantly, the "sexual privation induced hysteria, which was desirable because it could be transformed into war fever and leader worship" (Orwell, 1977, pp. 132–133). This is further explained by Julia:

> When you make love you're using up energy; and afterwards you feel happy and don't give a damn for anything. They can't bear you to feel like that. They want you to be bursting with energy all the time. All this marching up and down and cheering and waving flags is simply sex gone sour. If you're happy inside yourself, why should you get excited about Big Brother and […] all the rest of their bloody rot? (p. 133)

This indicates that the Party suffocated the sex instinct to utilise this energy for its own purposes by making Party members active supporters of its cause.

If the restriction of sexual freedom is the most powerful weapon that ensures the Party's control, as it is indicated in the novel, it is natural that mutually enjoyed sexual act that is not related

to procreation is presented as the most powerful way of resisting its control. When it comes to Julia, who does not aim for revolution, her sexuality is what poses the biggest threat to the Party, as suggested by Tirohl (2000):

> Whereas Julia might only seem to be a threat to those in power if she could inspire others to rebel, her genuine power lies in her 'deviant' behaviour: sexuality directed for her own pleasure and not towards the Party. Any behaviour lying outside the Party's control is viewed throughout the book to be potentially dangerous for it. (p. 57)

Tirohl points out that what makes Julia's sexuality dangerous for the State power is that it escapes its control. Thus, through her sexuality, Julia is also depicted as providing Winston with the means of opposing the State. It is also described how Julia's sexuality represents the opposition of the Party to Winston: he dreams about Julia tearing off her Party overalls with a movement that "seemed to annihilate a whole culture, a whole system of thought, as though Big Brother and the Party and the Thought Police could all be swept into nothingness by a single splendid movement of the arm" (Orwell, 1977, p. 31). Thus, Winston is described as associating the sexual act with opposing the Party, and their first sexual act is referred to as "a political act" (p. 126). This agrees with Tirohl's (2000) suggestion that "each sexual act signifies a weakening of The Party, as each one demonstrates urges which are, temporarily, outside its control" (p. 55).

To summarise, sexual activity in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is depicted as a threat to the Party, since it could make citizens more concerned with their own lives and less with the Party's cause. Sexual freedom would also make people happy, but it is their sexual frustration the Party needs to support its power. Therefore, Winston and Julia are described as opposing the Party through sexual acts and their relationship in general, since these are, at least temporarily, outside Party's control. Similarly to *We*, sex is represented as an uncontrollable aspect of the protagonist and Other's relationship that does not comply with the dystopian norm; therefore, besides an act of resistance, it is presented as an authentic feature in the relationship whose function is not predetermined by the State. Thus, the sexual act represents an act of humanity, and the romantic relationship represents the hope of something personal and humane existing in people despite the State's propaganda and constant supervision. In addition, Julia's sexual experiences with multiple men and her revelation that also some Inner Party members had wanted to have sex with her is described as giving Winston hope that the Party's control being less absolute than it seems:

> Anything that hinted a corruption always filled him with a wild hope. Who knew? Perhaps the Party was rotten under the surface, its cult of strenuousness and self-denial simply a sham concealing iniquity. (Orwell, 1977, p. 125)

Hence, to Winston, Julia's experiences represent a possibility for change, since there may be other Party members who wish to gain sexual freedom; if even some Inner Party members were corrupted, maybe the whole system could eventually be destroyed.

In *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Zamyatin and Orwell depict dystopian societies that restrict sexuality. In Zamyatin's One State, sex is reduced to another bodily function and citizens' sexuality is rationalised; each citizen is assigned a certain number of sexual days based on scientific tests, and only on these days they have fifteen minutes for sexual activity with the chosen partner. In Orwell's Oceania, sexual activity between Party members is forbidden outside marriage, and through propaganda, the Party aims to remove all pleasure from sex and promote its function as a means of procreation only. In both novels, the eccentric female Other is depicted as breaking the norms of the society in terms of sexuality, which is presented as a factor in the protagonist's process of change. It is described in *We* how I-330 and Δ-503 have sex not on a sexual day and during the communal hours, when citizens should serve the State by working or studying. Due to I-330's sexuality, Δ-503 is depicted as developing a second identity that is driven by an uncontrollable sex instinct and jealousy. Julia depicted in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* similarly breaks the norms of the State by being unmarried and having sex with Party members without the attempt of procreation. It is described how through her sexuality, she provides Winston with the means of opposing the Party through sexual acts that are outside the Party's control. In *Brave New World*, on the other hand, Huxley presents sexuality in an opposite manner to the other two dystopias, and instead of restricting sexuality, the society depicted in the novel encourages, or even demands, sexual promiscuity.

As suggested by Sunstein (2005), sexual promiscuity in *Brave New World* is depicted as functioning as "a kind of opiate of the masses, consistently encouraged partly in order to discourage political rebellion" (p. 238). Hence, whereas in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the restriction of sexuality is depicted as a means of making people invested in supporting the State power, in *Brave New World*, sexual promiscuity is supposed to keep the citizens docile. The aim is the same, namely, to prevent people from resisting the totalitarian State power. The dystopian society of *Brave New World* is based on consumerism, which is also applied to people as sexual products, and therefore relationships should be short-termed, and the other person should be considered most of all a sexual product. In London of the brave new world, people are not allowed to get attached to anything, and instead of representing sexual freedom, promiscuity is the dystopian norm of the State with which one must comply. This is indicated by the description of Lenina's friend's, Fanny's, horror when Lenina tells she has only been with one man, Henry Foster, in four months. It is pointed out how Henry, on the other hand, has been a perfect gentleman, as he has been seeing other girls as well (Huxley, 2004, p. 35). One of the slogans the State is depicted as planting in people's minds by conditioning, as

discussed in Section 2, is "Everyone belongs to everybody else", which is rather similar to *Lex sexualis* of the One State described in *We*, and it indicates one's duty to be available for others at all times. Even though one was not "feeling very keen on promiscuity" from time to time, like Lenina is depicted as feeling, "one's got to make the effort, […] one's got to play the game", as Fanny is described as replying while nodding sympathetically and understandingly to Lenina's statement (p. 37).

As discussed in Section 2, there is not as clear a contrast between the woman of the dystopian norm and the eccentric Other presented in *Brave New World* as there is in *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, and it does not have an intelligently distinctive female character. Nonetheless, in terms of sexuality and emotions, Lenina is depicted as somewhat different from the dystopian norm. Already in the beginning of the novel, Lenina is depicted as disagreeing with the set norms of the society since, as mentioned above, she does not see anything wrong with being so long as four months with only one man, which would be frowned upon or could even cost Lenina her job if her supervisor knew. Furthermore, she is tired of promiscuity encouraged by the society. Thus, whereas in *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four,* breaking the norm is represented by free sexual interactions, in *Brave New World* it is represented by withholding from promiscuity, which presents Lenina as a character who seeks a more meaningful relationship than the society offers her. However, Lenina is still depicted as restricted by her conditioning, due to which she cannot separate sex from love, since that is what love is reduced to, and therefore cannot be the true eccentric Other John is described as seeking. In the end, it is described how Lenina is prepared to have sex with John, while he tries to convince her of how he should first earn her love and then they should get married; however, Lenina cannot understand John and continues to undress, at which moment, to John, Lenina begins to represent the dystopian society he needs to escape in order to restore his sense of humanity.

All in all, controlling sexuality is presented as a significant aspect of restricting the individual freedom of the dystopian societies depicted in the three canonical dystopias. Both Zamyatin and Huxley present a society where everyone should be available for everyone else as a sexual product, which represents sexuality as an aspect of consumerism. Nevertheless, whereas Huxley describes a State that demands sexual promiscuity, Zamyatin imagines a rational approach to sexuality that relies on scientific tests in defining the individual's sexual needs, based on which the individual is assigned a certain number of sexual days that are the only times sexual activity is allowed. Orwell, on the other hand, presents a totalitarian State in which sexuality is considered the greatest threat to the State, which is why it is strictly controlled by forbidding sexual activity outside marriage and using propaganda to remove the pleasure from the sexual act. Whereas in Huxley's *Brave New World* sexual

promiscuity aims to keep the citizens docile, in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* sexual frustration is used to make people invested in supporting the State power.

In *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the eccentric Other is depicted as promoting her sexual freedom that represents the individual freedom in general, and her sexuality functions as the catalyst for the protagonist's process of change. Zamyatin describes how Δ-503, who is originally depicted as a rational mathematician adoring the rigid State organisation, develops an animalistic second identity driven by sex instinct, which represents the power of fundamental human traits that cannot be extinguished by the ultimate rationality. Orwell, on the other hand, depicts Julia as pursuing the sexual freedom itself, since it is presented as the most essential aspect of her individuality, and through her and Winston's relationship, they are able to covertly oppose the State power through sexual acts that escape the Party's control. Since the Party is depicted as restricting the sexuality of its members and aiming to remove the pleasure from the sexual act so that people would completely devote them to the Party's cause, sexual activity that breaks the dystopian norm contributes to the authenticity, or humanity, of Julia and Winston's relationship in comparison to the norm of the dystopian society of Oceania that is based on Party's ultimate control over any relationship.

When it comes to Lenina depicted by Huxley in *Brave New World*, her sexuality is described as different from the dystopian norm to some extent, as she is not keen on sexual promiscuity demanded by the State, but it is described how she cannot overcome the dystopian norms with John, who is depicted as promoting traditional values that forbid pre-marital sex, which Lenina cannot understand, since marriage does not exist in the civilised brave new world. Hence, the depiction of Lenina in terms of her sexuality humanises her to some extent, since it indicates that she does not want to consider people only as sexual products but seeks a deeper bond with someone; however, it is presented how she is fundamentally unable to have a relationship that does not equal sexual act due to the conditioning performed by the State, and thus, her sexuality is not represented as an element that liberates her from the dystopian norm as in the depictions of I-330 and Julia.

3.2. Emotions: love, empathy and jealousy as humanising characteristics

In the previous section, I discussed the representation of sexuality in *We*, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, and how it is related to the depiction of female characters and their effect on the male protagonist. In the novels' dystopian societies, sexuality is strictly controlled by the State since it is regarded as a threat to the State power; it is restricted so that the State can utilise the energy of people's frustration for its own cause, as depicted in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, or sexual promiscuity is required from the citizens so that they remain docile, as illustrated by Huxley in *Brave New World*.

Therefore, not complying with the dystopian norm in terms of sexuality is an act of resistance, and it becomes symbolic of an authentic personality. The uncontrollable sex instinct foregrounded in *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* reflects the idea of fundamental human traits that cannot be repressed by the State; thus, it relates to promoting the humanity over the dehumanisation the dystopian States are depicted as practicing. Similarly to sexuality, emotions are strictly controlled in the novels' societies. However, whereas the approach on sexuality varies between the novels, all three authors imagine a State that aims to remove intense natural feelings, which indicates that emotions are something that the authors considered significant for the human society. Therefore, analysing the depiction of the emotions of the female characters and the protagonists affected by the Other is an important aspect in terms of the representation of hope in a canonical dystopian novel.

In all three novels, the State is depicted as guaranteeing endless happiness to its citizens, but on its own terms and based on its own definitions of happiness, which are promoted by strict State control and manipulation to the extent that the citizens are either truly believing in their happiness, although all individuality, emotions and meaningful relationships are erased, or they are too intimidated by the State to demonstrate their discontent. In *Brave New World*, as discussed in Section 2, Huxley describes a State where genetic manipulation is used to generate castes that are designed to fulfil different work tasks, and sleep conditioning is used to teach the moral code. One of these slogans defines the society's view on emotions: "When the individual feels, the community reels" (Huxley, 2004, p. 81). The State is depicted as manipulating the emotions of its residents, similarly to their thoughts, with conditioning and *soma*, since strong feelings are considered a threat to the society because they foreground individuality. Only the people of the highest caste, Alphas, are designed and conditioned so that they are capable of thinking for themselves, since they are responsible for the occupations requiring high mental capacity, such as creating the slogans that the citizens are conditioned to believe in, supervising the functioning of the hatcheries, and conducting hypnopaedia. Therefore, they are also capable of understanding their feelings; hence, it is no surprise that Bernard and Helmholtz are depicted as unhappy, as Bernard tries to find passion and Helmholtz aspires for greater artistic possibilities. It is implied in the novel that this kind of dissatisfaction is not that unusual in the brave new world, since there is a tradition of sending the Alphas who question the society's norms to islands where they are isolated from the civilised society. This procedure, however, is presented only in the case of Alphas.

Although John and Helmholtz, and Bernard to some extent, are depicted as resisting the dystopian norms in the novel in terms of individual thought and emotions, it is the description of Lenina's emotions that truly represents hope inside and outside the novel. Lenina is a Gamma and therefore should not be capable of complex thought; she works at the conveyor belt, adding certain

injections into the bottles of embryos, which is all she must be able to do. She is mostly described as a woman of the dystopian norm: she is vain, detests ugliness, takes *soma* to balance her emotions, repeats the slogans, fears solitude and cannot understand the concept of a romantic relationship that is not based on sex. Nevertheless, she is depicted as falling in love with John and realising that she is not happy without him. Although it is indicated that Lenina is attracted to John solely because of his good looks, since it is not told that Lenina is interested in anything else in him, her emotions are depicted as developing into something that at least resembles love. In the dialogue between Lenina and her friend, Fanny, she wonders whether John likes her or not:

> She couldn't make it out; and not only was bewildered; was also rather upset.
>
> 'Because, you see, Fanny, *I* like him.'
>
> Liked him more and more. (Huxley, 2004, p. 144, emphasis in original)

Thus, Lenina is described as confused with her own growing feelings towards John. Furthermore, in another scene, after she and John have returned from the *feelies*, movies that can be felt as well as seen and heard, it is described how Lenina is sure that John asks her to come up to his apartment, but as he only wishes her good night and lets the taxi take her home, she starts crying and has to take an additional doze of *soma* to cope with her pain. Hence, she is depicted as having stronger feelings than she is used to having.

As the narrative proceeds, Lenina is described as developing feelings that are uncommon and more intense than those typical for the standardised citizens. This is demonstrated in two scenes, where Lenina struggles with the confusion triggered by John's apparent rejection. In the first scene, Lenina has finally decided to tell John about her feelings, and she is described as anxious and blushing at the thought of John's answer, although she is originally depicted as confident with men. John, however, refuses to attend Bernard's party, where Lenina has intended to reveal her feelings, which causes an outbreak of emotions in Lenina:

> Lenina alone said nothing. Pale, her blue eyes clouded with an unwonted melancholy, she sat in a corner, cut off from those who surrounded her by an emotion which they did not share. […]
>
> Lenina suddenly felt all the sensations normally experienced at the beginning of a Violent Passion Surrogate treatment – a sense of dreadful emptiness, a breathless apprehension, a nausea. Her heart seemed to stop beating.
>
> 'Perhaps it's because he doesn't like me,' she said to herself. And at once this possibility became an established certainty: John had refused to come because he didn't like her. He didn't like her… (Huxley, 2004, pp. 151–152)

Thus, Lenina's emotions are depicted as uncommon in comparison with the dystopian norm, and she realises that they separate her from others. Furthermore, her feelings are described as too powerful in comparison to the allowed amount of feelings, since the emotions she feels are supposed to be triggered only by the Violent Passion Surrogate (V.P.S.) treatment, which is given to each citizen once a month. In V.P.S. treatment, the person's system is flooded with adrenin; "It's the complete psychological equivalent of fear and rage", which is compulsory, since having one's "adrenals stimulated from time to time" is "one of the conditions of perfect health" (p. 211). Hence, Lenina's feelings for John are powerful enough to trigger emotions she is not supposed have without the artificial trigger, since regular dystopian citizens should be docile and passive due to conditioning and the use of *soma*.

In the second scene, it is described how Lenina's feelings affect her behaviour and work performance, which is demonstrated in a dialogue where Henry Foster thinks Lenina is ill since she looks weary and by the shook of her head indicates that she does not want to go out with Henry that night nor is going out with anyone else either:

> 'Perhaps you need a Pregnancy Substitute,' he suggested. 'Or else an extra-strong V.P.S. treatment. Sometimes, you know, the standard passion-surrogate isn't quite…'
>
> 'Oh, for Ford's sake,' said Lenina, breaking her stubborn silence, 'shut up!' And she turned back to her neglected embryos.
>
> A V.P.S treatment indeed! She would have laughed, if she hadn't been on the point of crying. As though she hadn't got enough V.P. of her own! She sighed profoundly as she refilled her syringe. 'John,' she murmured to herself, 'John…' Then 'My Ford,' she wondered, 'have I given this one its sleeping-sickness injection, or haven't I?' She simply couldn't remember. (Huxley, 2004, pp. 163–164)

First, in the passage above, it is described how Lenina gets angry, which is uncharacteristic for the dystopian citizens, since it is depicted how the State conditions the citizens to believe that "everybody's happy now" (e.g., p. 65), and if they are about to get aggressive, they take *soma* to avoid the conflict. Second, Lenina is described as shouting at her superior, whom she is conditioned to respect as an Alpha but also as her supervisor at work. Third, she is described as having mixed emotions, since she does not know if she should laugh or cry, and as realising that her emotions are too powerful in comparison with the norm. And fourth, it is indicated that her emotions prevent her from performing her work task, even though work is the ultimate essence of one's existence in the society described in *Brave New World*, since for that purpose people are genetically and mentally engineered. Hence, Lenina's emotional development is depicted as partially overriding the careful

conditioning by the State, even though she is only a Gamma and thus supposed to be a wholly regular dystopian individual.

Lenina is hence depicted as having emotional growth, since she is described as developing feelings of attachment toward John. Furthermore, to Lenina, John seems uninterested in having a sexual relationship with her, which is described as confusing Lenina and making her develop emotions that are uncharacteristically powerful for regular dystopian citizens, since the State is depicted as extinguishing natural feelings of its people. In the dystopian society imagined by Huxley, the lack of emotions is considered the basis of society's stability and the guarantee of happiness: in the text, it is depicted how the leader of the zone of Western Europe, the Resident World Controller Mustafa Mond, states to the Alpha students that happiness could not be achieved in the past, since the possessive relationships, poverty and sickness left no choice but to feel strongly; but now, "No pains have been spared to make your lives emotionally easy – to preserve you, so far as that is possible, from having emotions at all" (Huxley, 2004, p. 37). Since Mustafa Mond reveals this to the Alpha students, at least some Alphas are depicted as knowing about the attempt to remove emotions and about the customs of the past, and it is therefore reasonable that some of them resist the dystopian norm and seek passion like Bernard. Nevertheless, this is not expected from the lower castes, which makes Lenina a representative of the hope for humanisation; although she is described as a mostly regular citizen of the controlled society, the humane emotions of affection are more powerful than the careful engineering she has undergone. Krishan Kumar (1987) suggests that

> the very suggestion of a development in Lenina, following the impulse to pursue her happiness, is an indication that the stuff of a very different sort of happiness – and the possibility of tragedy – is a potentiality of even so debased a culture as Brave New World. (p. 287)

This is the essence of Lenina's embodiment of hope in the narrative; her emotional development is depicted as powerful enough to derail the systematic genetic and mental manipulation, thus promoting the idea of fundamental human feelings that cannot be fully suppressed, which indicates that the author views emotions as a powerful resource in resisting dystopia.

In *Brave New World*, description of Lenina's emotional growth is the most significant feature in her representation, since it functions to distinguish her from the dystopian norm and humanises her, even though she is depicted as lacking the intelligence and other individual characteristics that are significant aspects of individualisation of the eccentric Others in *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Change on the emotional level is in the centre of these two dystopian novels as well, but whereas in *Brave New World* it is Lenina who is depicted to develop emotionally, in *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the eccentric Other is depicted as triggering the change in the male protagonist. The lack of

descriptions of I-330's and Julia's emotions is probably due to the narrator; *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are narrated only from the perspective of the male protagonist, Zamyatin using the first person narrator and Orwell a third person narrator whose view is limited on Winston's perspective, whereas in *Brave New World* also Lenina's perspective is used, since Huxley's third person narrator has no limits. Nevertheless, the effect the female Others have on the protagonists as depicted in the narratives implies that also they are different from the dystopian norm on the emotional level.

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four,* the sexual aspect of Julia and Winston's relationship and its relation to their resistance of the Party's control is emphasised, but their emotional bond depicted in the novel has equally important role in the narrative, and it is significant in terms of the representation of fundamental human traits. The dystopian society presented in the novel is depicted as lacking the emotions of both tragedy and love, which is indicated when Winston thinks of his mother:

> Tragedy, he perceived, belonged to the ancient time, to a time when there were still privacy, love, and friendship, and when the members of a family stood by one another without needing to know the reason. His mother's memory tore at his heart because she had died loving him, when he was too young and selfish to love her in return, and because somehow, he did not remember how, she had sacrificed herself to a conception of loyalty that was private and unalterable. Such things, he saw, could not happen today. Today there were fear, hatred, and pain, but no dignity of emotion, or deep or complex sorrows. (Orwell, 1977, p. 30)

This scene takes place before Winston starts his relationship with Julia, and it indicates his yearning for an unconditional and loyal bond with another person, although this should not exist in their present world where the Party has annihilated or distorted all emotions. Therefore, even though Winston's need for sexual outlet is emphasised in the novel, as discussed in the previous section, he is also depicted as yearning for companionship, which he seeks to establish with Julia.

Hence, the authentic, intense emotions do not exist in the novel's dystopian State, and therefore a meaningful relationship cannot exist either. Nevertheless, Winston is characterised by the yearning for the loyal and unconditional bonds of the past that are represented by her mother. It is noteworthy that Winston is described as associating his mother with the ideal relationship; according to Baruch (1991), "The fantasy of romantic love represents the [e]utopia of the individual, the paradisal connection to the good mother of our childhood before the external world with all its restrictions intervened" (p. 226). In the case of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Baruch's notion seems accurate, since it is indicated that the unconditional relationship Winston had with his mother is the ideal he seeks with Julia as well. Besides the scene cited in the paragraph above, there is another scene, where Winston thinks of his mother:

> He did not suppose, from what he could remember of her, that she had been an unusual woman, still less an intelligent one; and yet she had possessed a kind of nobility, a kind of purity, simply because the standards that she obeyed were private ones. Her feelings were her own, and could not be altered from outside. It would not have occurred to her that an action which is ineffectual thereby becomes meaningless. If you loved someone, you loved him, and when you had nothing else to give, you still gave him love. (Orwell, 1977, p. 164)

Here, it is indicated that Winston respects his mother for not resigning her personal morals. This depiction of Winston's mother resembles the depiction of Julia as a woman who follows her own interests the Party cannot control, which is a characteristic that Winston is described as admiring in her. Thus, the romantic relationship between Winston and Julia is associated with Winston's relationship with his mother, and it is described how he reclaims more memories of her as his relationship with Julia deepens. The relationship based on unconditional love that does not need a rational reason for its existence is presented as Winston's eutopia, which he tries to establish with Julia; they promise not to betray each other, in essence, not to let the Party stop them from loving each other if they are caught by the Thought Police, even though "that can't make the slightest difference" (p. 166). Julia and Winston's relationship represents a private eutopia that reminds Winston of the past and the unconditional love of his mother and gives him an opportunity to return the loyalty of his mother by being loyal to Julia.

Thus, Julia is depicted as someone who makes Winston reclaim the feeling of unconditional love he associates with his mother, even though he had thought that similar feelings could not exist in the society distorted by the Party's ideology; therefore, Julia represents the hope of having authentic emotions despite the dehumanising State control. Besides the feelings of affection, Julia is depicted as making Winston able to feel compassion. In the beginning of the narrative, before Winston properly meets Julia, it is described how Winston walks on a street in the prole district when a bombing takes place, after which he sees a human hand severed at the wrist; then, "He kicked the thing into the gutter" (Orwell, 1977, p. 84). Winston's lack of emotions in the scene indicates his disregard for other people, which is the dystopian norm of the State of Oceania depicted in the novel. However, Julia is depicted as changing Winston's attitude toward other people. In the scene where Winston and Julia meet properly for the first time, as Winston still thinks she seeks to denounce him, he is described as feeling empathy, when Julia suddenly stumbles and falls:

> A sharp cry of pain was wrung out of her. She must have fallen right on the injured arm. Winston stopped short. The girl had risen to her knees. Her face had turned a milky-yellow color against which her mouth stood out redder than ever. […]

> A curious emotion stirred in Winston's heart. In front of him was an enemy who was trying to kill him; in front of him, also, was a human creature, in pain and perhaps with a broken bone. Already he had instinctively started forward to help her. In the moment when he had seen her fall on the bandaged arm, it had been as though he felt the pain in his own body. (pp. 105–106)

Even though Winston does not know Julia yet and has already decided to hate her since he is convinced that she works for the Thought Police, he is suddenly described as recognising her as a human being. As the relationship with Julia proceeds, the more empathic Winston is described as becoming; he starts seriously thinking about joining the revolution for the sake of the future generations, even though it would mean certain death. Thus, by evoking the feelings of love and compassion in Winston, Julia is depicted as making him more human.

Inside the narrative, Julia thus represents the possibility of finding something authentic in the society where everything personally significant is supposed to be abolished by the State power. With her affection, she is described as providing Winston with a private eutopia inside the dystopian society. She is also depicted as Winston's reason to stay alive: "At the sight of the words *I love you* the desire to stay alive had welled up in him, and the taking of minor risks suddenly seemed stupid" (Orwell, 1977, p. 109). Furthermore, as their relationship has developed to the point that they see each other regularly in the old-fashioned apartment in the prole district, Winston notes that "The process of life had ceased to be intolerable, he had no longer any impulse to make faces at the telescreen or shout curses at the top of his voice" (p. 150). In the State of Oceania pictured in *Nineteen Eighty-Four,* making faces and shouting curses are acts that would lead to an arrest and death, and hence, depicting Winston as reluctant to do so indicates that his life is no longer meaningless to him and that he wants to remain in existence. The feeling and promise of love represent a wall that separates Winston and Julia from the Party and that they think cannot be broken, and thus they escape the Party's control. Similarly to Lenina in *Brave New World*, Julia is depicted as an example of an apparently normal citizen of a dystopian society, and there is no reason why she should not be loyal to the Party and comply with its doctrines; unlike Winston, Julia does not remember the time before the Party was in control. Still, she is depicted as an eccentric Other who can offer the emotional bond Winston seeks. Hence, she represents the hope for a possible change and the strength of humane emotions.

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four,* Winston is thus described as experiencing a change on the emotional level, which is triggered by Julia, and which humanises Winston as he is described as becoming capable of empathy and reclaiming the feeling of unconditional love he thought is lost in their dystopian society. A similar effect is connected to I-330 in *We*, although the feelings she is described

as triggering in the protagonist, Δ-503, are rather different. In the One State imagined in *We*, the relationship between Δ-503 and the eccentric I-330 is mostly based on Δ-503's powerful sex instinct triggered by I-330, which she is indicated to utilise in planning her revolution. Unlike in the other two novels, it is not the feelings of love that are depicted as humanising the protagonist, but passion and jealousy. In *We*, love is described as equalling sex, and it is rationalised in order to control people:

> It's natural that, having subordinated Hunger […], the One State led the offensive against the other ruler of the world – against Love. At last, that elemental force was defeated as well, i.e. organized, mathematicized, and some 300 years ago our historic *Lex sexualis* was proclaimed: "Every number has the right to any other number as a sexual product." (Zamyatin, 2017, p. 22)

This rationalisation culminates in laboratory tests and sexual days signed by the State, as mentioned in the previous section. Most of all, the aim seems to be the elimination of jealousy and the feeling of possessing someone:

> It's clear: there are no longer any reasons for envy, the denominator of the fraction of happiness has been reduced to zero – the fraction is turned into magnificent infinity. And that very thing which for the ancients was the source of countless utterly stupid tragedies has been reduced by us to a harmonious, pleasantly beneficial function of the organism, just like sleep, physical labour, the ingestion of food, defecation, et cetera. (p. 23)

Thus, love is reduced to sex, which for its part is reduced to a bodily function without any relation to the emotional level, and it is jealousy that is named as the reason for struggles in the past, namely, before the revolution that established the One State. Jealousy is thus depicted as the crucial characteristic of the individuals that existed before the One State. Therefore, it is significant that the strongest emotion described as arousing in Δ-503 due to I-330 is jealousy, and that he is described as desiring to own her in a world where everybody should be available for everybody.

The jealousy is linked to the second identity Δ-503 is described as developing after meeting I-330. In the text, the emergence of this identity is presented through mirrors and by referring to Δ-503's hairy hands and eyebrows, which indicates the animalistic nature and otherness of this new identity in comparison with the Δ-503's original, rational identity. This second identity, Δ-503's jealous other self, emerges, for instance, when Δ-503 learns that his friend, R-13, has been with I-330:

> "What… have you – have you been with her as well?" he [R-13] filled with laughter, choked and was about to splash at any moment.
>
> My mirror hung in such a way that you had to look at yourself in it across the desk: from here in the chair I could see only my forehead and eyebrows.

> And now I – the real one – caught sight in the mirror of the mangled, jumping straight line of my eyebrows, and the real I heard a savage, repulsive cry:
>
> "'As well' what? No: what's that 'as well'? No – I demand it."
>
> Stretched Negroid lips. Goggling eyes… I – the real one – seized that other me – savage, shaggy, breathing hard – firmly by the scruff of the neck. I – the real one – said to him, R-:
>
> "Forgive me, for the Benefactor's sake. I'm really ill, I'm not sleeping. I don't understand what's wrong with me…" (Zamyatin, 2017, p. 63)

Although in the passage Δ-503 apologises to R-13, after R-13 leaves, he knows that he is not going to see him again and that their friendship is over. Next, Δ-503 is described as realising how I-330 affects his emotions more powerfully than her assigned sexual partner, O-90, who is assigned to R-13 as well, but this love-triangle is described as having strengthened the bond between all three of them; they were "a family" (p. 44). However, now with I-330, Δ-503 is described as confused about his feelings:

> Why is it – well, why is it that O- and I have lived so amicably for three whole years, and suddenly now just one word about that woman, about I-… Surely it can't be true that all that madness – love, jealously – isn't only in the idiotic ancient books? And the main thing is – me! Equations, formulae, figures – and… this – I don't understand a thing! Not a thing… I'll go and see R- tomorrow and say that…
>
> It's not true: I won't go. Not tomorrow, nor the day after – I'll never go again. I can't, I don't want to see him. It's the end! Our triangle's collapsed. (pp. 63–64)

In the quotations above, Δ-503 battles between his devotion to the One State and its norms and his unexplainable feelings towards I-330, and in the end, he chooses to break his family over her, since he cannot deal with the jealousy.

Δ-503's jealousy is described as culminating on the Day of Unanimity, where I-330 with her fellow rebels, R-13 among them, vote against the re-election of the One State's leader, the Benefactor. It is described how Δ-503 sits afar from I-330, and already before the voting, sees that R-13 was there with her: "With eyes unraised, all the time I can see those two – I- and R- – next to one another, shoulder to shoulder, and trembling on my knees are someone else's – my own hateful – shaggy hands" (Zamyatin, 2017, p. 139). The awakening of the other self is once again represented by shaggy hands that were but were not Δ-503's own. Then, in the riot caused by the voting, the rebels try to escape, and Δ-503 sees R-13 carrying injured I-330, which is described as stirring the Δ-503's irrational other self even more:

> Like a fire at the time of the ancients, everything turned crimson – and there was only one thing to do: jump, get them. [...] now I was already close, now I grabbed R- by the scruff of the neck:
>
> "Don't you dare! Don't you dare, I say. Right now."
>
> […]
>
> But he only smacked his lips angrily, shook his head and carried on running. And at this point – I'm incredibly ashamed to record this, but it seems to me I have to nonetheless, I have to record it so that you, my unknown readers, can make a complete study of my case history – at this point I struck him on the head as hard as I could. You understand – struck him! That I remember distinctly. And I also remember: a feeling of a kind of liberation, of lightness throughout my body from that blow. (pp. 140–141)

It is thus described how jealousy makes Δ-503 hit R-13, which is the culmination of his violent behaviour, but although he later redeems this shameful—when his rational self is in control—at the moment he is described as liberated by following his inherent instincts that disagree with the dystopian norms of the State. Hence, jealousy makes Δ-503 violent, which breaks the State's norms, and it also makes him uncontrollable by the State; he becomes an individual with feelings and thus more human. It seems that whereas Orwell and Huxley more or less promote the love as the uncontrollable and inherent source of humanity in their dystopias, Zamyatin foregrounds the more animalistic elements of a human, namely the sex instinct and jealousy that leads to violence, which in *We* are depicted as being triggered by I-330 and developing into "a soul" that causes Δ-503 to question the One State and make him separate himself from the mass of numbers.

To summarise, depictions of emotions are connected to the element of humanisation in *We*, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, since the dystopian societies depicted in the novels rely on suppressing the unwanted emotions; in essence, people are not supposed to have intense feelings if they are not intentionally triggered by the State, and feelings of love and attachment between people are regarded especially harmful to the State. In *Brave New World*, it is described how Lenina develops feelings of love and anxiousness that are uncommon in the society, since the State's aim is to remove all emotions to promote stability. Lenina's emotional growth is a significant element of humanisation in the novel, and it contributes to the representation of hope since she is depicted as an apparently regular citizen, who due to the genetic and psychological engineering and the active use of *soma* should not be able to have powerful emotions.

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *We*, the depicted development of emotions concerns the male protagonists, but it is triggered by the eccentric female Others. In the former, it is depicted how Winston yearns for his mother's unconditional love and loyalty, which he thinks cannot exist in the

present society, but with Julia, he is able to reclaim these lost feelings. Furthermore, as soon as Winston properly meets Julia, he is described as developing feelings of empathy he had lacked before; hence, Julia is described as humanising him. Although Julia's emotions are not described from her perspective, depicting her as an eccentric Other who is with Winston because of her personal feelings of affection instead of the need to fulfil the duty of procreation to the Party indicates that she has emotions a standardised Party woman should not have.

In *We*, due to the meetings with I-330, Δ-503 is described as developing a second, irrational identity that is driven by a sex instinct, and jealousy is depicted as its distinct characteristic, since it wants to possess I-330. Jealousy, in the novel, is presented as the reason for the irrationality of the ancient society, and the One State is described as proud of having abolished this irrationality from the present, which is why Δ-503's jealousy, similarly to the sex instinct, represents an uncontrollable fundamental human trait. Thus, the main female character functions as a catalyst to the humanisation process of the protagonist, and her emotions depicted in the narrative distinguish her from the dystopian norm and hence humanise her by contributing to her depiction as an individual with a personal identity.

4. Female characters and the representation of hope in a canonical dystopian narrative

In Introduction, I discussed the background of literary dystopia as a subgenre of utopian literature and how it relates to its seeming opposite, eutopia. The basic distinction established is that dystopia imagines a perverted society, whereas eutopia imagines an ideal one. Both subgenres, and utopian literature in general, are characterised by estrangement, as suggested by Darko Suvin (2010), although canonical literary dystopia and traditional literary eutopia use different methods in creating this effect. Eutopias picture a traveller guided in the ideal society, thus they use physical dislocation to estrange the reader, whereas dystopias approach the estrangement by imagining a resident of the dystopian society who realises the faults of the society as the plot proceeds. According to Martin Schäfer (1979), this makes literary dystopia more dynamic than literary eutopia and moves the main conflict into the narrative, between the protagonist and the dystopian State, instead of being outside the narrative between the author's present society and the author himself as in eutopias. Also, the focus of literary dystopia changes from the organisation of the ideal community emphasised in literary eutopias to the individual's freedom in the society perverted by totalitarian conformity. In a literary dystopia, estrangement is thus closely related to the counter-narrative of resistance that Baccolini and Moylan (2003) suggest is crucial for the dystopian narrative; it pictures the protagonist slowly learning the terrible truth about the society, which makes him feel the need to resist the State in one way or another. Nevertheless, traditional eutopia and canonical dystopia have similar aims, since both give hope for a better future; literary eutopia by imagining the ideal future, and literary dystopia by imagining a debased society that can still be avoided.

Hence, despite the differences in the narrative, literary eutopia and literary dystopia share a similar function, namely giving the reader hope for the future. Canonical dystopias aim to warn people of the dangers of their present tendencies and make them see their own potential in preventing the dystopia. In order to make the readers act to prevent the dystopia from becoming a reality, instead of making them fall into despair, hope is an essential element in a dystopian novel, or any utopian narrative, as pointed out by Lyman Tower Sargent (2010):

> The utopian views humanity and its future with either hope or alarm. If viewed with hope, the result is usually a [e]utopia. If viewed with alarm, the result is usually a dystopia. But basically, utopianism is a philosophy of hope, and it is characterized by the transformation of generalized hope into a description of a non-existent society. Of course, hope can often be nothing more than a rather naive wish-fulfilment, […]. On the other hand, hope is essential to any attempt to change society for the better. (p. 8)

Thus, without the representation of hope, a literary dystopia cannot fulfil its function, which indicates that the vision of perverted future society without any hope cannot represent the genre of dystopian literature. In the literary dystopias discussed in this thesis, *We*, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, I suggest that hope is present both inside and outside the narrative; outside the narrative, it reminds the reader that the dystopian future can still be avoided, and inside the narrative, hope is related to those aspects the author seems to consider important in resisting the dystopia.

In the canonical dystopian narrative, the representation of hope is connected to the humanisation of the main female character. As discussed in this thesis, the eccentric main female character is depicted as an individual who resists the norms of the dystopian State and she embodies the humane elements that are repressed in the dystopian society, such as personal identity, sexuality and emotions; hence, she is humanised in the narrative. The main female character is also depicted as a catalyst who triggers these humane elements in the protagonist, thus humanising him as well. In *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the main female characters also have a significant political role, since they are described as capable of seeing through the State's motives and propaganda; in *We*, I-330 is even depicted as the leader of the revolution against the One State. Hence, these main female characters are given a role of power in the narrative in relation to the dystopian State, even though they are defeated in the end. Therefore, the humane features are considered significant in resisting the dystopian State power, which links them to the hope of avoiding the perverted future. Even though all main female characters are defeated in the end of the novel, their significance for the representation of hope is not diminished. Elaine Baruch (1991) states that

> Still, in the imagination, woman is the savior in dystopia, pitted against *We*'s Guardians and (later) Big Brother. She is the savior, not in the sense of the eternal feminine who leads men upwards and onwards, […], but rather as the vital force that pulls men back and down into memory and feeling, […]. (p. 210)

Hence, the main female character provides the male protagonist with the safe haven, a private eutopia, that reminds the protagonist of the time before the dystopian State was established, and she continues to represent this eutopia to the reader even after her defeat in the novel. Therefore, the hope for the better future remains as well.

4.1. Humanisation of the female character and hope: fundamental human traits and association with the past

The humanisation of the main female character and the protagonist is characterised by four closely related aspects discussed in this thesis, namely individuality, free will, sexuality and emotions. These

aspects can be considered as the fundamental human traits that are often foregrounded in literary dystopias as the source of resistance; according to Eugen Weber,

> Insofar as the anti-utopian allows us a glimmer of hope, it lies in the instincts, in fantasy, in the irrational, in the peculiarly individualistic and egoistic characteristics most likely to shatter any system or order. This accounts for the importance of basic feelings—sex, love, selfishness, fantasy which all utopian planners try to control and in which all anti-utopians seem to put their faith insofar as they have any faith. (as cited in Baruch, 1991, pp. 210–211)

The factors Weber considers the essence of hope in literary dystopias, or anti-utopias, are in *We*, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* embodied in the main female characters: I-330 is depicted as an intelligent leader of the revolution, whose eyes are described as hidden behind the lowered blinds and her face as crossed out to distinguish her from the transparency of the State and its citizens; Lenina is described as developing feelings of love that should not exist in the standardised citizen who has been genetically engineered and carefully conditioned by the State; and Julia is depicted as a person who laughs at the propaganda and is only concerned about her own life, especially the sexual aspect of it, which she intends to enjoy by covertly breaking the rules set by the State.

Furthermore, the main female characters also reveal the irrational aspects of humanity to the protagonists. In *We*, the protagonist, Δ-503, is described as a rational standardised citizen until he meets I-330, who triggers his sex instinct, making him develop a second irrational personality characterised by jealousy, and he becomes partial in the revolution to be together with I-330. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, on the other hand, Julia as a sexual outlet provides Winston with a means of opposing the State power, in addition to which Julia triggers the feelings of unconditional love and compassion in him. In *Brave New World*, however, despite Lenina's emotional development, she is depicted as unable to overcome her conditioning, which makes her unable to separate sex from love and understand the concept of monogamy John is described as considering the only romantic relationship. Instead of revealing the truth about irrational human traits like I-330 and Julia in the two other novels, Lenina thus reveals the society's lack of principles John holds significant, which finally makes him truly detest the society. Therefore, to John, Lenina represents the crucial faults of the brave new world and makes him more devoted to his own values concerning love, faith and nature. Thus, John is depicted as realising what it signifies to him to be a human, and therefore Lenina still contributes to his humanisation.

The eccentricity of the main female characters in comparison to the norm of the dystopian citizen is foregrounded by contrasting her with the woman of the dystopian norm through a love-triangle setting. In *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* the love-triangle setting is prominent, but in *Brave*

New World it is in a less significant role. However, two love-triangle settings can be found in *Brave New World*, and they are described as affecting John's and Lenina's decisions, but they are not related to the foregrounding of the humane features *per se*. Instead, it is Lenina's emotional growth that functions as the most significant representation of hope in the narrative, since she should be a regular dystopian citizen but ends up developing personal feelings that should not exist in the regulated dystopian society. As discussed in the previous sections, in *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the original partner of the protagonist is depicted as the woman of the dystopian norm, who represents the standardised citizens of these dystopias. The descriptions of the eccentric other woman, I-330 in *We* and Julia in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, are contrasted with the descriptions of the dystopian women, which foregrounds the humane features of sexuality, emotions, and personal identity embodied in the Other's character. In addition, the Other's relationship to the protagonist is humanised in the text by first depicting the relationship of the dystopian norm between the protagonist and his original partner; whereas the regular dystopian relationship is depicted as artificial in the sense that it cannot be controlled or initiated by the individual, the relationship with the Other is characterised by spontaneity and free will that breaks the rules set by the State. Hence, the love-triangle setting presented in the novels serves to associate the Other with the reader's normality by contrasting her with the inhuman dystopian norm, which helps to connect the eccentric Other with the elements depicted as significant in resisting the dystopia, namely, the humane features.

Besides embodying the fundamental human traits, such as individuality, sexuality and emotions, as discussed above, the main female characters are associated with the past, which contributes to their relation to the representation of hope as well, since in literary dystopias, the past often represents the only possible eutopia:

> While utopias look forward, dystopias look backwards—with nostalgia. It is women and love that mediate between the unsupportable present of dystopia and the longed-for past which has been replaced, which is indeed seen as a form of [e]utopia. (Baruch, 1991, p. 207)

This nostalgia in *We*, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, is related to the depiction of the female characters. As discussed in Section 2, in Zamyatin's *We*, I-330 is often described as wearing old-fashioned women's clothing from the time before the present State power, and in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Julia would at least prefer wearing such clothing, even though it is forbidden in both dystopian societies imagined. Furthermore, in both narratives, the secret hiding place of the protagonist and the Other, the private eutopia, is depicted as an apartment decorated in the old-fashioned manner. These are the concrete references to the past depicted in the novels. However, there are also other elements that relate the female characters to the past, namely their association with nature and the feelings they embody.

The three dystopian societies imagined in the novels are depicted as having separated themselves from nature; the cities are industrialised and the residents have either few or no possibilities to get out of the city, and in *We* and *Brave New World*, people are depicted as unwilling to spend time in the wilderness due to their conditioning. In these two novels, nature is associated with the primitive, ancient way of living, since in *We*, it is told that the people lived in the woods with the animals before the revolution, but now the wilderness has been separated by the Green Wall that surrounds the city, and in *Brave New World*, the Reservations where the "uncivilised" people live locate far from the cities and there people still comply with the norms of the ancient, such as marriage, motherhood and religion, that are abolished from the civilised brave new world. Therefore, nature relates to the past in these dystopian narratives.

Hence, the female characters' association with nature contributes to their association with the past. In *We*, I-330 is depicted as a teacher who tells Δ-503 about the past when people lived in the woods and respected nature, and she herself comes from the wilderness behind the Green Wall. In *Brave New World*, on the other hand, the nostalgia is related to the depiction of Linda, John's mother, who is associated with nature and the past, although, this is done through her implied representation to John in the novel instead of her representation to the reader. To the reader, descriptions of Linda foreground her unbreakable connection to the civilised brave new world, since she is depicted as a slave to the slogans and the morals of the civilised society after living more than a decade in the Reservation. However, as Linda dies, and it is revealed that Lenina cannot understand John's concept of love, Linda becomes a memory of the good old times and the norms of the Reservation that John is described as yearning for, even though it is originally described how he was never accepted as part of its community, which is the reason he chooses to leave for the civilised world. Finally, John isolates himself into a nearby lighthouse surrounded by nature, where he tries to recreate his life in the Reservation he now sees as the ideal way of living, as the only possible eutopia, with nature as its central element.

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, nature is not depicted as something to avoid *per se*, like in the other two novels, and it is not depicted as something that is generally related to the past in the novel's society. Nevertheless, Julia is associated with nature by the depiction of Winston's dream about the Golden Country, where he pictured Julia undressing the Party uniform, and by the depiction of their first secret meeting place, which was a clearing surrounded by thick bushes and woods that isolated them from the outside world, thus giving them a safe haven outside the Party's control. Golden Country is presented as a place that Winston possibly visited with his mother, and as discussed in the previous sections, Winston's mother as the source of unconditional love in the past is presented as the ideal Winston seeks. Therefore, Winston associates nature with his mother, who represents the

ideals of the past, which is why Julia's association with nature, the Golden Country in special, links her with the past that represents the eutopia. As discussed in Section 3, Winston is described as reclaiming his memories of his mother as his relationship with Julia proceeds, and he is described as yearning for the similar bond based on unconditional love as he had with his mother. Although Winston dreams of the future with Julia, his aim is to reach the eutopia of the past where his mother loved him unconditionally. Hence, it is the feeling of love that is also associated with the past in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, since Winston is described as thinking that it cannot possibly exist in the present society. Similarly, in the other two novels, feelings are repressed since they are considered the most crucial element in the troubles of the past, and therefore the depiction of the characters with these feelings reflect the connection to the past; in *Brave New World*, Lenina develops feelings of love, whereas in *We*, I-330 triggers the feeling of jealousy in Δ-503.

Krishan Kumar (1987) suggests that in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Orwell "intimates that, in the unlikely event of things getting better, the past – 'ancestral memory' – rather than some new future will be the path to a more human existence" (p. 297). This, however, seems to be the case in other two dystopian novels as well. As discussed, three elements can be recognised that relate the female characters to the past: the association with nature, the feelings they represent, and the concrete objects described in the narrative, such as setting and clothing. Of these, the feelings are most clearly related to the humanisation of the characters, although the other two contribute to the female character's depiction as an eccentric individual who differs from the dystopian norm, which humanises her as well. In addition, what is noteworthy, is the relation between the eutopia the protagonist yearns for and the protagonist's mother, as in *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Also, in *We*, the protagonist Δ-503 is depicted as yearning for a mother in the end of the narrative, after he has revealed everything he has done to the Benefactor, even though he has never had a mother, since the children of the One State are brought up in institutions. Hence, motherly love is presented as something fundamental for happiness and as fundamentally human, since it cannot be abolished even by the ultimate State control.

4.2. Female characters in the narrative of a canonical dystopian novel

In all three novels, humanisation is the key aspect of the main female characters; their instincts, emotions and eccentricity depicted in the texts distinguish them from the depiction of the norm of a dystopian citizen. So far, I have discussed the humanising elements that are embodied in the main female characters, namely the fundamental human traits and association with the past and nature. These elements are commonly seen as the aspects of representation of hope in the canonical dystopian

novel. Besides the elements that are depicted as characteristics of the female characters, the role of the main female character in the narrative foregrounds her significance in terms of the protagonist's humanisation process, which is a crucial element in a canonical dystopian narrative. According to Elaine Baruch (1991), in traditional literary eutopias written by men, the female characters are rarely given the power to affect the male protagonist, which is yet another difference between literary dystopia and eutopia:

> In male [e]utopias, women are deprived of their ancient power. In dystopia, they are granted it back again, with approval. In dystopia, it is women who are the agents of the hero's individuation, unlike in social reality or much other literature, for example, the *Bildungsroman*, whose hero must break away from women to achieve growth and development. (pp. 211–212)

Thus, women are often given more agency in male dystopias in comparison to male eutopias. Nevertheless, in male eutopias, the male characters have less agency as well, since the focus is on the organisation of the society; the eutopia promotes the common-good over the individual freedom, and the system assumes authority and responsibility over the human leadership, which is why the human must become a bystander in the presentation of the ideal system. Baruch also points out that in dystopias, unlike in many other literary traditions, the women contribute to the male protagonist's individuation instead of restricting it. Thus, as discussed in this thesis, female characters are depicted as crucial factors in the male protagonist's process of change and individuation, which forms the basis of counter-narrative of resistance that Baccolini and Moylan consider central for the narrative of a dystopian novel.

Hence, women in canonical dystopian novels often function as catalysts to the male protagonist's process of change. This is most distinctive in *We*, where the protagonist, Δ-503, is described as developing a second, animalistic identity driven by sex instinct that makes him break the One State's laws, which is the result of his meeting with the female Other, I-330. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Julia is depicted as a catalyst to Winston's rebellion since she provides Winston with the opportunity to resist the State power through sexual acts unapproved by the Party, but also as a catalyst to his humanisation through the unconditional love, companionship and compassion she evokes in Winston. In *Brave New World*, on the other hand, Lenina, together with Linda's death, reveals to John the terror of the loveless society which makes him choose the old values of the Reservation and act against the civilised State power. In addition, it is John, who as the Other affects Lenina's humanisation process by triggering the feeling of love in her. Kathryn M. Grossman (1987) argues that the women in *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* also crucially affect the development of the protagonist's social and political consciousness:

> Because of her, he rejects the conventional mentality of his nation to espouse an even broader peer group, humankind as a whole. Equality no longer means sameness, but resemblance through diversity. (p. 143)

Although this is the case in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, in *We*, the protagonist, Δ-503, is not described as reaching the state of humanity in terms of seeking the common good or gaining an understanding of the society's faults and realising the worth of humans as individuals. Instead, his process of humanisation in the text is characterised by the feelings of jealousy and passion and the sex instinct that cannot be controlled by the One State, and his motives are related only to I-330; as soon as it turns out that she only used him to progress her revolution, it is described how Δ-503 wishes to confess their crimes, which he finally does in the end, as he still feels responsible to the One State. Nevertheless, I-330 is depicted as a crucial catalyst to Δ-503's process of humanisation; in addition to triggering his uncontrollable sex instinct and feelings of jealousy, she makes him break the norms of the society and, at least to some extent, she makes him question the necessity of promoting the whole over an individual, we over I, which is depicted as the basis of the dystopian organisation of the One State.

Grossman (1987) suggests that the role of the main female character in the classical dystopian narrative, such as *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, is that of a temptress, although not in a completely traditional sense:

> The temptress figure is one negative female stereotype that has pervaded western consciousness ever since Eden was lost to a beguiled Adam. But in […] classic science fiction dystopias […], the temptress enjoys a more privileged status. Instead of merely seducing the male protagonist out of his earthly paradise, she charms him into seeing it in a new manner. In other words, she does not just enchant him; she also disenchants him, for it is through her that he comes to know his world for what it really is—inhuman monstrosity. (p. 135)

Hence, Grossman suggests that even though the temptress, the Other, enchants the protagonist to leave his normality, she at the same time disenchants him from the dystopian norm. As a temptress of this kind, the Other would once again contribute to the counter-narrative of resistance and the process of the protagonist's humanisation. Thus, Grossman's suggestion is rather similar to the one suggested in this thesis, although the use of the term 'temptress' may be misleading, at least in the case of Julia, who is not depicted as actively trying to engage Winston with the resistance of the State; rather, Julia's acts are motivated by her own agenda of enjoying the life to the fullest by covertly breaking the rules, and she is not interested in the full-scale revolution like Winston. I-330, on the other hand, can be characterised as a temptress as suggested by Grossman, since she is depicted as actively trying to enchant Δ-503 to believe in her cause—or if not the cause itself, then in her—and

her only motivation in establishing a relationship with him is that she needs Δ-503 who is the head engineer of the *Integral*, the spaceship the One State is building, since the rebels' aim is to take over the *Integral* so that the One State could not spread its ideology any further. In addition, I-330 literally seduces Δ-503, which makes her a traditional temptress.

Although Grossman does not discuss *Brave New World* in her article, based on her concept of a dystopian temptress, also Lenina can be considered a temptress; because of her, John is first enchanted by the possibilities the civilised world may offer and chooses to leave the Reservation, and at the end of the novel, he is disenchanted by Lenina, to whom love equals sex, which makes John see the horrors of the society more clearly than ever before. Hence, Grossman's idea of the female character's role as a temptress in a sense that she is depicted as a catalyst to the protagonist's change that leads him to see the inhumanity of the society seems mostly accurate. Even though the term 'temptress' may pose some problems, Grossman is still one of the few that has identified the role of the main female character in a dystopian novel as significant in terms of its narrative.

The main female characters of *We*, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* thus have a role of agency that is based on their influence on the protagonist's process of change, and their agency is highlighted by depicting them as different from the dystopian norm of the society; they are intelligent individuals with personal identity and emotions. Through them, the male protagonist learns the truth about the society they live in. According to Peter Brooks (1993), there is a long tradition of associating women with truth that must be unveiled by a man through sight:

> Sight is the sense that represents the whole epistemological project; it is conceived to be the most objective and objectivizing of the senses, that which best allows an inspection of reality that produces truth. […] But truth is not of easy access; it often is represented as veiled, latent, or covered, so that the discovery of truth becomes a process of unveiling, laying bare, or denuding. […] the epistemic principle, and the point from which vision is directed at the world, have largely throughout the Western tradition been assumed to be male, perhaps especially within the history of philosophy. That which is to be looked at, denuded, unveiled, has been repeatedly personified as female: Truth as goddess, as sphinx, or as woman herself. (p. 96)

Brooks (1993) continues to suggest that

> Sight, knowledge, truth, and woman's body: such nexus intertwines central and highly charged attitudes and gestures of our culture. Man as knowing subject postulates woman's body as the object to be known, by way of an act of visual inspection which claims to reveal the truth—or else makes that object into the ultimate enigma. Seeing woman as other is necessary to truth about the self. (p. 97)

Thus, it is often the woman's body that is used to represent truth and knowledge, which is learnt by the man through vision. This association between truth and a woman emerges from the canonical literary dystopias as well. In *We*, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the female characters reveal the truth of the dystopian society, and in all three novels is described a moment, when the main female character undresses for the first time, and these moments are turning points in terms of the male protagonist's realisation about what is missing from the dystopian society, and from this moment on, they start moving away from the dystopian norm to resist the State power.

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it is described how Julia undresses the Party uniform for the first time in front of Winston and throws it away with the movement of the arm that seemed to annihilate the whole Party, as mentioned in Section 3, and after this, Winston and Julia perform the sexual act for the first time, which is depicted as the most concrete act of resistance Winston has committed. Afterwards, Winston is described as having reclaimed the reason to live, actively planning to take down the Party and becoming more humane through love and compassion. In *Brave New World*, on the other hand, it is described how Lenina undresses her clothing piece by piece, while John tries to stop her since he has tried explaining her how he wants to marry her, and once she is naked, John starts shouting and violently pushing her away. After this moment, John is depicted as acting against the State power by trying to throw away the daily doses of *soma* meant for some lower-caste citizens. Thus, he takes action against the State, and finally proceeds to move into an abandoned lighthouse outside the city. In *We*, Δ-503 does not see I-330 undressing her uniform, but hears her instead:

> And now a fastener clicked at the collar – at the breast – lower still. Glassy silk rustles over the shoulders, the knees – over the floor. I hear – and it's even clearer than seeing – from out of the light-bluish-grey silken heap has stepped one leg, then the other…
>
> […] And I hear – I see: behind me, she's thinking for a second. (Zamyatin, 2017, p. 53)

However, in the scene, hearing is contrasted with seeing, and it is described how Δ-503 could in his mind see I-330 undress. Once again, this is depicted as a crucial moment, since after this, Δ-503's irrational other identity is described as emerging for the first time in the narrative, which indicates his change from the rational scientist devoted to the One State into the irrational slave of I-330 and the sex instinct triggered by her.

Thus, the idea of women as the objects representing the truth that must be unveiled by the man seems to emerge in the canonical dystopias as well. In the novels of my interest, the truth is revealed by vision, as suggested by Brooks, since the male protagonist either starts becoming aware of the society's faults or takes action to oppose the State power after seeing the woman undress, thus revealing herself to the protagonist either as the eccentric individual that foregrounds the faults of the society by being so different like Julia and I-330, or by embodying the faults of the society in herself

like Lenina. In all three novels, the revelation of the female character finally leads to the humanisation as well; Δ-503 is described as developing a sex instinct and feelings of jealousy and passion, Winston as developing feelings of love and compassion, and John as rehumanising himself by enforcing his faith in love, religion and faith he considers fundamental to humanity.

To summarise, in canonical literary dystopias, women represent the truth the protagonists need to learn about the fundamental human traits and the past to become more humans. In this thesis, I have focused on emotions, sexuality and the overall contrast between the eccentric Other and the dystopian citizens, which contribute to the humanisation of the main female characters, who affect the protagonists' humanisation process as well. Due to this humanisation, female characters represent hope, since the dystopian societies depicted in the novels are built on State control and manipulation of the citizen, with the aim of abolishing all individuality and replacing it with masses of identical citizens that are completely controlled by the dystopian State. Therefore, the female characters' eccentricity in the State of ultimate conformity is a significant factor in the representation of hope. Hope is an essential aspect of literary dystopias, even though the visions of future they present may trigger desperation with their negativity. Nevertheless, the aim is to share a warning that includes hope of preventing the terrible future. Darko Suvin (2010) states that "the defeat IN the novel is not the defeat OF the novel – that is, of its potentially liberatory effect on the reader" (p. 353). This summarises the potentiality of a dystopian novel and its relation to hope. The hope of preventing the dystopian future is mostly related to the novel as a whole, but the female characters seem to embody the aspects that the author considers essential in resisting the dystopia, namely individuality, emotions and instincts that can be seen as fundamental human traits.

All in all, it seems that the female characters are the most significant catalysts in the process of change, humanisation in special, that the protagonists of literary dystopias undergo and that forms the central narrative of the novels. Based on the depiction of female characters in the novels, the woman's role in the canonical literary dystopia is to embody individuality, humane emotions and instincts; only through experiencing this kind of a real woman with an authentic identity that is not completely restricted by the dystopian norms, the male protagonist is able to become a real man capable of resisting the dystopian State power. Since in this thesis, my main focus lies on the representation of hope, further analysis on the role of the female characters in relation to other elements of dystopian narrative could be relevant. For instance, it seems that the main female characters and the contrast provided by the love-triangle setting are central aspects of the counter-narrative of resistance, which has been mentioned several times in this thesis, and which is another significant feature in the canonical dystopian narrative. Therefore, besides contributing to the

representation of hope, female characters may have other essential functions in establishing the elements defined as central to the canonical literary dystopia as a genre.

5. Conclusion

In this thesis, I have analysed the representation of female characters and their relation to the representation of utopian hope in three canonical literary dystopias: Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We* (1921), Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1948). The main female characters are depicted as eccentric, intelligent individuals with distinct characteristics, whereas the regular citizens of the imagined dystopian societies are depicted as a standardised mass completely controlled by the State power. The main female characters are also characterised by an unorthodox view on sexuality and by personal feelings, which is eccentric since emotions are considered a threat to the social stability and therefore the State aims to abolish natural feelings from its dystopian society. Hence, the main female characters embody the fundamental human traits that are often emphasised in literary dystopias as the only source of hope in resisting the dystopia. The main female characters are also associated with the past by associating them with nature and depicting them as having feelings that should not exist in the imagined dystopian State. In addition, the main female characters are depicted as catalysts to the protagonist's process of humanisation and individualisation. Due to these aspects, the main female character is humanised in the text, and her humane features are contrasted by the woman of the dystopian norm through a love-triangle setting, which further foregrounds her eccentricity.

The humanity of the main female character represents hope for a better future both inside the narrative and outside the narrative. The main female character is described as embodying the characteristics the author seems to consider crucial in resisting the potential dystopia, thus making her representation a significant factor in transmitting the utopian hope to the reader. Hence, the representation of female characters contributes to the function of dystopian novels, namely giving the reader hope of avoiding the inhuman future dystopia depicted in the narrative. However, despite the similarities in the three narratives discussed in this thesis, the emphasis on what is significant in resisting the dystopia varies. Whereas Zamyatin emphasises the significance of animalistic features, namely the uncontrollable sex instinct and violent jealousy in being a human, Huxley foregrounds the role of chastity, religion and love. Orwell, for his part, presents sexual freedom as profound to the individual freedom and emphasises the significance of unconditional love.

Finally, further analysis on the role of the female characters in relation to other elements of dystopian narrative could be relevant, since it seems that the main female characters and the contrast provided by the love-triangle setting are central aspects, for instance, in the counter-narrative of resistance, which is another significant feature in the canonical dystopian narrative. Therefore,

besides contributing to the representation of hope, female characters may have other essential functions in establishing the elements defined as central to the canonical literary dystopia as a genre.

List of References

Baccolini, R., & Moylan, T. (2003). Dystopia and histories. In R. Baccolini, & T. Moylan (Eds.), *Dark horizons: Science fiction and the dystopian imagination* (pp. 1-12). London: Routledge.

Baruch, E. H. (1991). *Women, love, and power: Literary and psychoanalytic perspectives.* New York: New York University Press.

Brooks, P. (1993). *Body work: Objects of desire in modern narrative.* Cambride: Harvard University Press.

Clayes, G. (2014). The origins of dystopia: Wells, Huxley and Orwell. In G. Clayes (Ed.), *Cambridge companion to utopian literature* (pp. 107-131). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fludernik, M. (2009). *An Introduction to Narratology*. London: Routledge.

Frow, J. (2015). *Genre*. Routledge.

Grossman, K. M. (1987). Woman as temptress: the way to (br)otherhood in science fiction dystopias. *Women's Studies (14)*, 135-145.

Huxley, A. (2004). *Brave New World*. London: Vintage Classics. (Original work published in 1932)

Jameson, F. (2007). *Archaeologies of the future: The desire called utopia and other science fictions*. London: Verso.

Kumar, K. (1987). *Utopia and anti-utopia in modern times.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Kumar, K. (1991). *Utopianism*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Miller, C. R. (May 1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, (70)*, 151–167.

Orwell, G. (1977). *Nineteen Eighty-Four.* New York: New American Library. (Original work published in 1949)

Reich, R. (December 2012). Dehumanization through the enforcement of ideology in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. *East-West Cultural Passage, (12)*(2), 33–48.

Sanders, S. (March 1977). Invisible men and women: The disappearance of character in science fiction novels. *Science Fiction Studies*, *4*, 14–24.

Sargent, L. T. (2010). *Utopianism: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schäfer, M. (November 1979). The rise and fall of antiutopia: Utopia, gothic romance, dystopia. *Science Fiction Studies, (6)*(3), 287–295.

Sunstein, C. R. (2005). Sexual Freedom and Political Freedom. In M. C. Nussbaum, J. Goldsmith, & A. Gleason (Eds.), *On Nineteen Eighty-Four: Orwell and Our Future* (pp. 233-241). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Suvin, D. (2010). *Defined by A Hollow: Essays on Utopia, Science Fiction and Political Epistemology*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Tirohl, B. (March 2000). `We are the dead...you are the dead': An examination of sexuality as a weapon of revolt in Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 9(1) 55-61.

Vieira, F. (2014). The concept of utopia. In G. Clayes (Ed.), *Cambridge companion to utopian literature* (pp. 3-27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zamyatin, Y. (2017). *We*. (A. Hugh, Trans.) Richmond: Alma Books Ltd. (Original work published in 1921)